

legislative week. It will be my intention to ask to go over when I have announced the program for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I might advise my colleagues that next week legislatively will be a very important week.

The program is as follows:

Monday is District Day—no District bills.

H.R. 9022, assistance for public schools affected by major disasters and base closing; uniformity of eligibility requirements under Public Law 874, 81st Congress;

House Joint Resolution 403, 22d World Health Assembly—open rule, 1 hour debate;

H.R. 7811, authorizing the sale or loan of naval vessels to friendly Latin American countries—open rule, 1 hour debate;

H.R. 7812, authorizing the loan of naval vessels to Italy and Spain—open rule, 1 hour debate;

H.R. 7813, authorizing the loan of naval vessels to Turkey, China, and the Philippines—open rule, 1 hour debate;

H.R. 8333, establishing a program of cash awards for members of the Armed Forces and for other purposes—open rule, 1 hour debate; and

H.R. 2091, relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service—open rule, 2 hours debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, the supplemental appropriations, 1966, Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

H.R. 2580, amending the immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes—open rule, 5 hours debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment;

H.R. 9567, Higher Education Act of 1965—open rule, 2 hours debate; the bill is to be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections;

H.R. 9042, Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965.

This announced program is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for the purpose of some unanimous-consent requests, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Select Committee on Small Business may have permission to sit during general debate while the House is in session on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS OF HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in general debate on August 23.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the majority leader if the bill is to be read by title and if it is his understanding the rule provides that it be open to amendment at any point as the titles are read?

Mr. ALBERT. The bill is to be read by title instead of by sections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 240 of Tuesday, page 19932 of the RECORD, I am listed as being absent. I was here in the Chamber and answered "present" to my name and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

STEPHEN M. PETERSON AGAINST H. R. GROSS (H. DOC. NO. 271)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1965.
The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the contestee in the contested-election case of Stephen M. Peterson against H. R. Gross, from the Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa, the Clerk has received a motion to waive filing of briefs, for immediate hearing, and to dismiss contested-election, Third Congressional District of Iowa.

The communication in this matter is being transmitted for referral to the appropriate Committee of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

Fe. Rumsfeld
EDITORIAL ON VIETNAM

(Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. Watson) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following significant and timely editorial which appeared in today's issue of the New York Times and which discusses our involvement in Vietnam merits wide attention. I concur in the conclusion expressed therein that the people of the United States must know not only how their country became involved but where we are heading.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress raised the question as to what was the desirable degree congressional involvement in national security and foreign policy decisionmaking. Again in my separate views on H.R. 5665, to authorize disbursements to armed forces of friendly foreign nations—which the House Committee on Government Operations reported earlier this month—I discuss briefly the trend in recent years toward the yielding up by the Congress of its constitutional responsibility with respect to its powers relating to the declaring of war. I am including these views herewith for the possible interest of the Members and to stress once more the deep significance of this matter to the Nation and our system of government.

The material referred to follows:

[From the New York Times]

THE EISENHOWER DEMURRER

The battle on the Van Tuong peninsula makes evident the extent to which American troops are now directly engaged in combat in South Vietnam. In these circumstances the question of how the United States got into this land war in Asia takes on political as well as historical interest.

Both were involved in the remarks of former President Eisenhower, who conferred with Republican congressional leaders, then demurred from President Johnson's frequent suggestion that the current military involvement in Vietnam is the consequence of a Republican commitment given in 1954. The fact that the Korean war became a critical domestic political issue in 1952 is in all minds.

General Eisenhower emphasized his belief that "the Communists must be stopped in Vietnam." But he said that his October 1954 letter to President Ngo Dinh Diem, often quoted by President Johnson, was a pledge of foreign aid, not military involvement. And he stressed that he never made a unilateral military commitment to South Vietnam, only a multilateral engagement through the southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Both points are well taken.

It was a unilateral decision by President Kennedy in 1961—not a SEATO decision—that launched the program of massive American military assistance to South Vietnam. Most Asians and most American allies in Europe have always had deep reservations about it. This undoubtedly will continue to

August 19, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20299

road grade crossings which were to create work for the unemployed and reduce a traffic hazard which claimed the lives of many people annually. It was financed by a 2-cent increase in the gasoline tax. Most important, in the special session of 1931 the groundwork for the first unemployment compensation program in the United States was laid. Some of the excessive tax burden on property was reduced by shifting more of the levy to the income tax. An inescapable problem was to raise money for direct relief and again the legislature turned to the income tax. Because of the financial difficulties of the State, the Governor in January, 1932, voluntarily took a 20-percent reduction in salary.

LaFollette's first term may be characterized in the second place by an effort to redefine the function of government. The long period of economic development had been associated with the minimum of governmental interference. It was LaFollette's feeling that it was the function of government to take a more active part in the long-range planning of the economy. Although his first term saw a breakthrough in authority of municipalities to establish powerplants through revenue bonding, it was not until his third term that his most comprehensive plans were proposed.

In 1932 LaFollette again met Walter J. Kohler, Sr., in the primary election for the gubernatorial nomination, and this time Kohler won by nearly a hundred thousand votes. The Roosevelt landslide aided by the support of the progressive element of the Republican Party resulted in the election of Albert Schmedeman, a Democrat, as Governor with Democratic control of the assembly and Republican control of the senate.

After 1932 the progressive element of the Republican Party considered the question of working from within the Republican Party or establishing a new party. Contrary to the decision made earlier by the elder LaFollette, the new generation of progressives determined to establish a new party and in the spring of 1934 the Progressive Party was created in Fond du Lac. Phil LaFollette was its candidate for Governor and in a 3-cornered race against the incumbent Schmedeman and Howard Greene who was the Republican candidate, LaFollette won the election of 1934 by less than 16,000 votes.

Two years later LaFollette was again the candidate of the Progressive Party while Alexander Wiley was the Republican candidate and Lueck the Democratic contestant. LaFollette polled over 200,000 votes more than Wiley and over 300,000 votes more than Lueck. He also secured a working majority in both houses of the legislature.

LaFollette had long advocated the strengthening of the executive branch of the State government, and when he began his second term in 1935 he sought to bring that about. Granted authority to reorganize the administrative agencies, he issued a series of orders which sought to accomplish this. While this authority of the Governor and the resulting orders were quickly abolished in 1939 when the Republicans gained control of the government, a substantial number of the reforms ultimately crept back into the State organizational pattern.

Among his proposals was an executive council composed of legislators and laymen created to study legislative problems and submit such problems to the legislature. Many people consider it the predecessor of the now well-established legislative council.

Much of LaFollette's last 2 terms, 1935-39, were concerned with reestablishing economic stability in the State and improving the public assistance program, but he did not lose sight of his long-range objective of public participation in the programs of long-range economic planning. Out of it came the Wisconsin Development Authority, some-

times known as the Little TVA, and the Wisconsin Agricultural Authority, but court decisions circumscribing their fields of endeavor and subsequent unsympathetic legislatures prevented these concepts from being firmly established.

In 1938 the National Progressive Association was launched in Madison, the main thesis of which was to bring the liberals of the various parties together in order to stimulate the creation of such a party within the several States. LaFollette won the candidacy of the Progressive Party for the governorship, but when the election was over Julius Hell, the Milwaukee industrialist who started in America as an immigrant boy, had beaten LaFollette by nearly 200,000 votes.

The LaFollette administrations, 1931-33, 1935-39, were periods of aggressiveness on the part of the executive. In the legislative session of 1937 the strong hand of the executive in shaping the legislative program probably reached its peak.

HE RETIRES TO PRIVATE PRACTICE AS AN ATTORNEY

After LaFollette retired from the governorship in 1939, he returned to his law practice. As the clouds of World War II began to gather, he applied for active duty in the Army, and spent 34 months of the war in the Southwest Pacific Theater where he rendered distinguished service on the staff of General MacArthur.

Placed on inactive duty in 1945, he returned to his law practice, and was associated with the law firm which ultimately became LaFollette, Sinykin, and Doyle in Madison. An able attorney, he rapidly gained the financial rewards which public office had denied him. His business interests in the field of electronics caused him to move to New York in the early 1950's, but he continued his association with his law firm in Madison to which he returned in 1959. Having attained the governorship at 35, he still retains the vigor of maturity and remains the dean of the surviving ex-Governors of Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of Philip LaFollette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 242 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

OF CABBAGES AND MOVIE KINGS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] brightened yesterday's Record by inserting a dinner address delivered in his State recently by actor Ronald Rea-

gan. The speech honored another of our colleagues, a highly esteemed Member across the aisle, Mr. ASHBROOK. It may be found beginning on page 20197.

Reports in California are that Mr. Reagan's advertising agency, seeking a "new image" for their client, had ordered him kept under wraps for a few weeks while they prepared a new basic speech for him. It was with keen anticipation, therefore, that I made my way through Reagan's printed remarks as inserted by Mr. DEVINE in the Record.

I was disappointed. It proved to be the same old speech—right down to a paragraph which, error for error, was the same as he delivered 2 months ago in San Diego, Calif. I quote:

The Declaration of Independence has 300 words—that's all it took for that immortal document. The Federal Government recently issued a ruling related to cabbage and it took 29,911 words.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan is an avowed candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor of California, and I will leave it to State officials to check the accuracy of his statements if and when he begins talking about the problems of California. Let us hope that the ad agency will then provide him with firmer facts.

The Department of Agriculture has no knowledge of a ruling related to cabbage—of 29,911 words or any comparable word count. I am afraid that a lifetime in the world of make-believe has caused Mr. Reagan to fall for one of the most durable hoaxes in political or publishing history. For I recall that this little squib about the verbose cabbage order first turned up in public prints during Korean war days. The baseless item bounced from newspaper to newspaper, each crediting the other, and it finally achieved the status of a "filler" in Reader's Digest.

But the item was no more reliable then than now. If Mr. Reagan can substantiate his tale that "the Federal Government recently issued a ruling related to cabbage and it took 29,911 words," I will personally undertake to raise \$1,000 for his upcoming gubernatorial campaign. If he cannot, I implore him to drop his standby speech until the agency writers have provided one which, hopefully, will be better researched.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, we have concluded our

August 19, 1965

20301

be one of the heaviest mortgages on American policy in southeast Asia and it would be unwise to ignore it.

The shift from military assistance and combat advice to direct participation by American combat troops in the Vietnamese war has again been a unilateral American decision, this time by President Johnson. Not only was congressional debate avoided, but there were repeated denials that such a decision had been made. Indeed, the whole effort was to make it appear that nothing had changed in American policy since 1954.

The American predicament in Vietnam is likely to deepen long before it is eased. American casualties are certain to mount. Solutions are complicated by a colonial heritage not of American making, but of which Americans unfortunately may become the heirs as their military numbers grow on Asian soil and as their firepower, unavoidably, takes a toll of civilians as well as guerrillas.

The military decisions of the past closed out diplomatic options that then were open. This is what must be avoided in the future. Difficult decisions that lie immediately ahead may become even more difficult politically when warfare gives way to negotiation, as one day it must. It is essential that the country be clear at every stage where it is being led and why. If this has not always been the case in the past, it is all the more reason for straightforwardness to be the rule now.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

I support H.R. 5665 as a bill that is unquestionably necessary, but have certain reservations which are stated below.

COMMENTS ON H.R. 5665

First, with respect to details of the bill, it is my impression that it is loosely drawn. The term "friendly nations" is not defined. Amid recent press reports that the U.S. Government was supporting financially two sets of combatant troops which were fighting each other in the muddled Dominican Republic crises, this broad discretionary language in the bill gains particular significance. Further, there is no dollar limit as to the amount of funds which may be used under the provisions of the bill, nor is there any provision as to how long such dollar advances may continue or remain outstanding. Regrettably, the 11 pages of hearings are sketchy on these points.

THE QUESTION ON PRESIDENTIAL "PEACETIME" WAR POWERS

H.R. 5665 represents but one small step in the post-World War II trend toward the voluntary piecemeal yielding up of Congress constitutional responsibility with respect to its powers relating to the declaring of war. The various legislative committees of the Congress deal separately with a whole range of proposals relating directly or indirectly to the Executive's "emergency" or "war" powers, not on a systematic basis based on a comprehensive study of this significant constitutional question, but rather on a piecemeal basis, in each seemingly minor instance to meet a very real and often pressing need of the moment.

The United States—according to top administration officials—is at war, whatever that means. I suggest that it is past time for the Congress to undertake a comprehensive study of this question in an attempt to define present meanings of such terms as "war," "limited war," "conflict," "police action," and other types of military or quasi-military involvements and, in fact, the whole spectrum of war situations which have or might replace the more conventional wars of past decades. Such a study should include consideration of each legislative committee's involvement in issues of national security and foreign policy and of existing statutes relating to Presidential powers in situations short

of declared war. Earlier this year in my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I urged that that committee consider this problem area (see pp. 17783-17785, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27, 1965).

Further, I urge that consideration be given to establishing policy guidelines with respect to the desirable degree of congressional involvement in each such situation and, conversely, the degree to which it is desirable to expand or decrease Presidential power in the various undeclared war situations so defined.

It is not necessary, desirable, or even safe for Congress to drift along with the country obviously at war, without either declaring war (which I am not suggesting) or, at least, redefining the term "war." It is the Congress' responsibility to determine and define, within the Constitution, the desirable degree of congressional involvement in the conduct of foreign policy and national security decisionmaking, and establish reasonable criteria upon which the distribution of power between Congress and the executive can be effected in an era of "limited war." Unless this is done, the once delicate balance of power between these two branches of Government will be decisively altered.

CONCLUSION

It would be easy to dismiss the questions raised on this rather obscure bill in that by itself this bill has little significance. However, if the Congress continues to dismiss such questions on this and similar bills, and on the constitutional question here raised, it is ignoring an issue vital to the existence of our system of Government. Possibly, it is wise to extend the "peacetime" emergency war powers of the President as is done by this bill, but it is clearly unwise to do so on any basis other than on a thoughtfully conceived systematic basis.

Congress should not continue to run the risk of being held accountable by future generations as bearing the principal responsibility for the inevitable alteration, or, to be specific, diminution, of its role, and thereby of the people's role, in world affairs, and for the revision and violation of our system of checked and balanced power.

(NOTE.—The Honorable ROBERT P. GRIFFIN concurs in the above views of Mr. RUMSFELD.)

Fe [Signature]
SALUTE TO THE TROOPS

(Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, headlines are being grabbed by groups of rabble rousers opposed to a firm U.S. stand in southeast Asia, by individuals who won't stand up and be counted on the side of our great national heritage but would rather lie down and be carried away in apparent support of Communist terrorism. Therefore, it gives me a great deal of pride to be able to point to a group of patriotic American citizens who have come forward to defend the men who are fighting for our liberties.

In Escondido, Calif., a group of local businessmen have come up with a wonderful idea to help boost the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam. They are circulating a petition, with an attached endorsement by the city council, saluting the important job American Armed Forces are doing in Vietnam. They expect to gather 10,000 signatures of endorsement and then turn the resolution over to the military newspaper Stars and

Stripes, so that the story can reach our men overseas.

I commend these good citizens for their idea and their work in executing it. I hope that by their good example they will inspire men and women in other communities across the country to follow suit.

The vast majority of the people in this country are in favor of taking a strong stand in Vietnam. When a minor flank of leftwing beatniks moves in to try to destroy the American will to protect freedom, every patriotic citizen should be happy to put his signature on the line in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I would like to include a copy of a letter written to the President by the originators of this idea, a copy of the resolution, and two newspaper stories relating to this subject:

ESCONDIDO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the many demonstrations going on in this country against the U.S. policies in Vietnam, we thought it high time for the responsible citizens of this country to voice their opinion.

The attached roll, "Salute to the Troops in Vietnam," was the result, together with a resolution of the city council of the city of Escondido, Calif. Our thought, Mr. President, in sending this to you is to express the viewpoint of the majority, that as Americans we know our responsibilities; that we will always uphold the honor and dignity of this Nation; that we are proud of our fighting men and women in Vietnam which makes freedom possible.

Enclosed are clippings from the Escondido and San Diego newspapers giving us publicity in support of this movement. Also, local radio has been very generous in giving us free time. Local church groups are carrying this message in their Sunday services.

On completion of this drive we intend to forward these signatures together with the city council resolution to the Stars and Stripes and other media of communication of our service personnel in Vietnam. In this respect any help you can give us would be appreciated.

One personal note, Mr. President: The three undersigned individuals salute you in this crisis and offer our prayers for your continued good health and judgment. God bless you.

Respectfully yours,
STUART G. HUNT,
Veteran World War II and Korea,
San Diego, Calif.
EARL W. STRONG,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired,
Escondido, Calif.
JAMES R. BRIGHAM,
Escondido, Calif.

RESOLUTION 3238

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Escondido expressing gratitude from the citizens of said city to the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam

Whereas thousands of American servicemen have been ordered to combat in Vietnam while at home the issues of the U.S. involvement are being debated; and

Whereas this Council as an elected body representing this community, and the individual members thereof, wish to express to their fellow citizens serving in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, who are pledging their lives to the principles of freedom, our awareness of their sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Escondido, Calif., That this Council on behalf of itself and on behalf of the people of the city of Escondido, hereby declares that we are proud of the members of the Armed Forces participating in the war in Vietnam, for they are upholding the honor and dignity of this Nation; and that we have deep respect for these servicemen, for they have not wavered in their duty to fight their country's battles; and that we are grateful to these men, for they are enabling us to continue to enjoy our freedom and prosperity; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to furnish copies of this resolution to all who may request it, so that it may be endorsed by those individuals and organizations who concur therein, and so that its message may be communicated to as many serving our country in the Vietnam area as is possible.

Attest:

LINA M. HILL,
City Clerk of the City of Escondido,
Calif.

Passed, adopted, and approved by the City Council of the City of Escondido this 4th day of August 1965.

ROBERT F. HARDING,
KENNETH M. ROBERTS,
FRED W. SPEERS,
LLOYD I. TURRENTINE,
Councilmen.
LEWIS P. TUSTIN,
Mayor.

[From the Daily Times-Advocate, Escondido, Calif., Aug. 6, 1965]

TEN THOUSAND SIGNERS WANTED FOR SALUTE TO MILITARY

A group of Escondido businessmen will hold a public meeting at 5 p.m. Monday in the council chambers at city hall seeking volunteers to pass petitions saluting U.S. military personnel in Vietnam. The businessmen are Stuart Hunt, Earl Strong, and Jim Brigham.

The group indicated the move is purely nonpolitical in nature. They said signing of the petition by Escondidans would be only for publicizing the fact that the work being accomplished by our service personnel is appreciated. They hope to have at least 10,000 signatures on the petition and the story printed in Stars and Stripes, the military newspaper overseas.

BEGIN TUESDAY

Plans are for circulation of the petitions to begin Tuesday and continue for 2 weeks. Also included will be a request for a banner to span Grand Avenue asking the people to salute the military personnel.

The group asks that any service club or organization interested in assisting in the program to send representatives to the meeting.

Following is the resolution unanimously passed by the city council Wednesday night expressing gratitude from the citizens of the city to the Armed Forces serving in Vietnam:

"Whereas thousands of American servicemen have been ordered to combat in Vietnam while at home the issues of the U.S. involvement are being debated; and

"Whereas this council, as an elected body representing this community, and the individual members thereof, wish to express to their fellow citizens serving in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps who are pledging their lives to the principles of freedom, our awareness of their sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Escondido, Calif., That this council, on behalf of itself and on behalf of the people

of the city of Escondido, hereby declares that we are proud of the members of the Armed Forces participating in the war in Vietnam for they are upholding the honor and dignity of this Nation; and that we have deep respect for these servicemen for they have not wavered in their duty to fight their country's battles; and that we are grateful to these men for they are enabling us to continue to enjoy our freedom and prosperity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the city clerk be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to furnish copies of this resolution to all who may request it, so that it may be endorsed by those individuals and organizations who concur therein, and so that its message may be communicated to as many men serving our country in the Vietnam area as is possible."

[From the San Diego Union]
THREE ESCONDIDANS MAP GI VIET
MORALE DRIVE

ESCONDIDO.—Three Escondidans have started a drive to counteract the impressions of many servicemen in Vietnam that civilians back home are apathetic or opposed to the war efforts in the Far East.

"Let's face it," commented one of the three, Earl Strong. "Those boys are over there because of us. They have to stay there and take it. And when they read the headlines about protest marches against the war, they wonder: 'What am I doing here?'"

COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Strong should know what the boys in Vietnam are thinking, because he served his last two tours of duty there before retiring as a colonel from the Air Force last year.

"What we are trying to do is to get a grass-roots, nonpolitical movement started to let the men over there know that the people over here appreciate the sacrifice they are making," Strong explained.

The idea turned into reality when Strong, Jim Brigham, and Stuart Hunt convinced the Escondido city council to pass a resolution putting this sentiment into a written pat on the back.

Brigham, a rancher, thought of the idea, and recruited Strong and Hunt—a Korean veteran and prisoner of war during World War II—as technical advisers for his project.

YOUNGSTERS INTERESTED

Armed with the formal resolution of the council, the three now are planning a volunteer campaign to obtain several thousand signatures from citizens who also want to send their prayers and gratitude to the men serving in Vietnam.

"We hope this idea will spread," said Strong. "We want to make it a personal thing. A letter to the individual serviceman from the people back home."

Plans for an area campaign to obtain signatures on the official resolution will be made at a Monday meeting at 5 p.m. in the city council chambers.

"We need hundreds of volunteers, and we are hoping to get youngsters interested in helping us. They are a wonderful bunch, and we need their drive and spirit."

When Strong expresses hope that the idea of the drive will mushroom, he's speaking nationally. "There ought to be a lot of other communities doing the same thing. This is a morale problem we are fighting."

Brigham's idea already has caught fire in the north county community. Clubs and churches contacted have agreed to help with the signature campaign. Individual volunteers are expected to be recruited at next week's open meeting.

"We think that this is the first effort of its kind," Strong stressed. "We sure hope it won't be the last."

DR. WEAVER'S ASSERTION THAT DISDAIN FOR THE POOR HINDERS URBAN RENEWAL IS COMPLETELY PROVED IN BOSTON, MASS., PROJECT

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week the Nation was treated to the sorry spectacle of low- and moderate-income citizens and their families being forcibly evicted and their homes bulldozed by the Boston Redevelopment Authority to make way for a luxury housing development in the North Harvard Street urban renewal project in Allston, Mass. The following day I made a personal appeal to Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the Federal Housing and Home Finance Administrator, who has jurisdiction over federally assisted urban renewal projects, asking him to exercise his responsibility and call a temporary halt to the evictions and demolitions taking place in the area until a full review of the project, including a possible change in reuse and approach, could be made. Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton called and talked to me about the North Harvard Street urban renewal project at the direction of Dr. Weaver.

I made this request in view of the fact that such diverse groups and individuals as the Massachusetts Committee on Discrimination in Housing, local and State Democratic representatives, the League of Women Voters, 10 of the top-ranking city planners in the State, and the Democratic City Council of Boston itself had also called for a change in the project and halt the demolition and eviction. Senator LEVERETT B. SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, joined in this appeal and also made similar direct representations to Dr. Weaver on behalf of the local citizens.

After nearly 2 days' delay, during which time additional evictions and demolition occurred, Senator SALTONSTALL and I were informed by Dr. Weaver late Thursday afternoon that Mayor John F. Collins, of Boston, had made a statement concerning the North Harvard Street urban renewal project. The mayor called for a reopening of the question of the best use of the project area after it had been cleared, reconsideration of the method of selecting the developer, and a study of the project by a blue ribbon panel of citizens after the area had been cleared and everyone had been evicted.

It would be an understatement to say that I consider this approach to be totally inadequate in the present situation. Never have I read such a cruel obituary of the hopes and desires of low- and moderate-income citizens. Unless this plan is changed to provide for a halt to the eviction and demolition process while the review of the blue ribbon panel is being made, Mayor Collins' statement will justly deserve a description as a po-

August 19, 1965

I wholeheartedly second this editorial and offer it at this point in the Record in the hopes that my colleagues will read it with similar approval:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 19, 1965]

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO REST

Practically ever since it began last January 4, this Congress has been in a frenzy—a frenzy of passing more revolutionary laws than any single session in modern times.

It has launched a broad program of Federal aid to grade school education, for example. It has enacted medicare; it has put the Negro voting rights law on the books; it has cut excise taxes.

It will take years for the administration of these laws to be smoothed out.

But still Congress meets, day after day, passing or preparing to pass laws that in many instances could better wait for next year, or even the year after.

It has on its docket such measures as those giving Federal aid to higher education, increasing minimum wages, repealing the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, rejiggering the farm program.

As a child of Congress, and against the background of legislative failures of President Kennedy, it is easy to understand why President Johnson keeps prodding Congress to go, go, go on passing his bills. He had the Democratic majorities to do this; he has a politician's desire to get the "hard ones" out of the way before next year's elections.

Now he has told congressional leaders that he has no additional requests to make of them, for which they and the country can give thanks.

But the point is that he already has asked so much that even with its extraordinary record Congress still has before it many of the President's Great Society bills.

We believe Congress is tired—tired of being pushed. We think the country is surfeited with new laws.

If there must be more Great Society laws, they'd be better laws if studied longer by a rested Congress that has had ample chance to talk with the folks back home.

If this administration is as smart politically as it is credited with being, we think it should do this:

Recommend to Congress that it do only its necessary chores quickly and then go home.

These chores would include the necessary appropriations, but cutting to the bone the domestic spending for "butter" while it allocates more and more money to the President to finance the Vietnam war.

And if done by Labor Day, the country and the Government would benefit.

(Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HALPERN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

U.N. A DEBATING FORUM ONLY

(Mr. HUTCHINSON (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Goldberg's statement at the United Nations, changing our position on the requirements of article 19 of the charter, amounts to a retreat before the forces of communism, and is very dis-

appointing to me. On this point in the cold war, many of us hoped that the United States would not back down.

There is another side to the matter, however. If the Communist bloc can refuse to respect assessments imposed against them by the United Nations, so can the United States and others in the free world. What can be done by one side can be done by the other. The meaning of our retreat is that the United Nations has no power to tax member nations against their will. Therefore, no part of the sovereignty of the United States has been surrendered to the world organization. The United Nations can function only as a forum for debate. In that role, it will perform a service because discussion is always to be preferred to war. It will not have power to compel; and since that is true, this Nation remains wholly sovereign.

IN MEMORY OF ST. STEPHEN

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is of particular significance to Americans of Hungarian descent because it is the day they honor their great national hero, St. Stephen I.

St. Stephen is considered to be the father of Hungary. He was crowned their first King in the year 1000 A.D. This act which marked the formation of a kingdom out of a former tribal confederacy was thus the most significant event in the long history of the Hungarian people.

The 38-year reign of King Stephen was spent in consolidating the new state. In developing Hungarian political institutions, King Stephen combined the traditions of his people with the advances made by his Western neighbors. He was extremely active in legislative, administrative, and financial areas.

It is therefore natural that the feast of St. Stephen, the patron saint of the Magyars, has special meaning for Americans of Hungarian origin.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the brave Hungarian people are suffering under the oppressive dictates of a Communist regime, their spirit of independence remains inspired by the memory of their great national hero, King Stephen. In present-day Hungary, a dramatic religious leader, Cardinal Mindszenty, serves the same inspirational role that St. Stephen, first King of Hungary, brought to his people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take this time to encourage the Hungarian-Americans working for the cause of restoration of freedom to their homeland to rededicate themselves to the memory of St. Stephen, and the historic greatness of their nation.

THE COMPLEX SITUATION IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to

extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the situation in Vietnam is growing in complexity, and recent actions of the President have not helped the situation. I refer specifically to the reappointment of Ambassador Lodge to a post he had previously filled in a most questionable fashion. At this point in my remarks I ask leave to insert in the Record an article which appeared in the August 1 issue of Our Sunday Visitor, by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.:

AMBASSADOR LODGE RETURNS (By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Two years ago our commander in South Vietnam, General Harkins, declared that the war was almost won. Secretary of Defense McNamara told us that most of our troops would be home by Christmas. Sir Robert Thompson, who was head of the British Advisory Mission to South Vietnam, notified his superiors at Whitehall that the Vietnamese Government "had turned the corner and was winning the country back from the Communists." Our distinguished career Ambassador, Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., agreed wholeheartedly with these reports and continued backing the Diem regime.

President Diem was so successful that the Communists were determined to get rid of him. It was their only chance to avoid defeat. In order to get him out, the Communists concentrated on a propaganda campaign against him. They soon convinced reporters that the Government was persecuting the Buddhists. Ambassador Nolting said that in 2½ years he had not seen any signs of religious persecution, but the correspondents kept reporting that there was. Their proof was the fact that several Buddhists committed suicide. A suicide actually does not prove anything, but pictures of two or three suicides in Saigon electrified the world. They even made a great impression on the White House.

Averell Harriman had been urging President Kennedy to appoint Henry Cabot Lodge as Ambassador to South Vietnam, and when Lodge walked into the President's office in June 1963, the President exclaimed: "Just look at this. Where is it all going to end?" He showed Lodge a newspaper photo of a Buddhist committing suicide. Kennedy told Lodge that the people in Vietnam were against President Diem and our policy there was liable to fail. He urged Lodge to go to Saigon and take over.

THE FIRST MISTAKE

The biggest single mistake about Lodge was for the administration to send him there in the first place. He did not have any experience in Asia, or as an Ambassador to any country. Both former President Eisenhower and former Vice President Nixon advised Lodge not to take the appointment. But he did, and he arrived in Saigon in August 1963 only to commit blunder after blunder. His first mistake was to present himself publicly to the leaders of the Buddhists before he called on the President of the country. Less than 24 hours after he arrived, he wired Washington that Diem would have to go. His next blunder was to grant asylum to the Buddhist monk, Thich Tri Quang, who had been trained by the Communists, and whose three brothers were Communists. Tri Quang had been giving the government a great deal of trouble, and Lodge gave him sanctuary in the embassy for 10 weeks, until Diem was assassinated, even though it was against our regulations. Tri Quang's pagoda was the headquarters for the Communist Youth Organization. Father Raymond de Jaegher has since testified that Tri Quang was a Communist all along.

August 19, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

ponents of BRA evictions in the North Harvard project in Allston and pledged "the sheriffs and police will deal quickly" with those who defy the law.

"More people will be moved out next week," Logue said sharply. "Let them keep their picket lines; I don't care."

To back up his stand Logue held a 2-hour star chamber session with his lawyers and Deputy Police Superintendent Joseph Sala and then announced:

"The moving vans will roll in there beginning Monday."

He also took a slap at Sheriff Frederick R. Sullivan, implying that his deputies had been stalling in serving eviction notices on the rest of the 50 families slated to lose their homes.

"He is usually 'uptown' when I try to phone him," Logue said sarcastically.

No decision has been made by the law department on the plan to rope off the area to keep "outside troublemakers" from the district during the evictions. However, Logue said there was "a likelihood that barriers will be used."

Back at the scene of the week-long eviction trouble. The North Harvard Neighborhood Association issued a statement charging that the first residents chosen for dislocation were those who led the opposition against the project from the very first.

"They were singled out to intimidate the rest of the community."

The statement charged the residents were denied the right to a court trial of the legality of the seizure of their homes. It stated that owners and rent payers have offered to have the court hold their arrearage in escrow until final determination of the case.

OFFERS TO PAY

James Wheelis and his wife, Jacqueline, carrying their infant, Erik, left their second floor home at 4 Hefferan Street and walked down to the mobile project headquarters.

Wheelis had his checkbook. He offered to pay his 8 months rent arrearage of \$414 to Joseph Buckman, project supervisor.

However, he added the stipulation that the BRA cease evicting all of the residents of the area.

Buckman said he would accept the money but refused to accept Wheelis' condition. The Wheelis couple and their baby left after the Harvard chemistry major called the project "immoral" and vowed to "sit here like a ton of bricks until we are dragged out."

SPREAD ALARM

At the same time, the neighborhood alert "post" was being manned by the "widow's brigade" to alert and bring into the area their supporters in the antirenewal battle.

By prearrangement, the warning that the mover's trucks are on the way is spread by phone to sympathizers in Cambridge, Charlestown, Mission Hill, Revere, Winthrop, West Roxbury, and even Wayland.

[From the Boston Record American, Aug. 6, 1965]

"CARRY US OUT" CRY EVICTEES BEHIND LOCKS
(By Jack Wharton and George Neary)

In defense of their homes and in defiance of eviction notices by the BRA, residents of the North Harvard St., Allston, area, Thursday barricaded their doors and vowed they would have to be carried out "bodily."

The leader of the barricade platoon was James Wheelis, a Harvard student who shares No. 4 Hefferan St., with his young wife, Jacqueline, and their 7-month-old Eric.

Nails were driven into a heavy beam and pounded into their front door.

Wheelis said "when the evicters come they'll have to smash their way in. We, will

stay inside the house and if they want to get us out they will have to carry us—and the baby—out bodily."

Other than the barricading, the streets, were quiet. There was an air of restless calm in the neighborhood. There were no police.

Behind the curtains, the neighbors peered out at the streets waiting for the reappearance of the sheriffs and the crowbar-toting evicters.

On North Harvard St., Mrs. Eunice Holm sat by the phone ready to rally her "widow's brigade" to the Wheelis home or any other residence singled out by the evicters.

Meanwhile, the city lawyers were studying the books to see if their plan to rope off the area to the exclusion of outside "troublemakers"—opponents of urban renewal projects in every section of the city—was covered by law.

The BRA has ruled that 50 families must be evicted from their \$40-\$80-a-month homes to make way for a 10-story plush tower building where the developers will rent them from \$175 to \$290.

[From the Boston Record American, Aug. 5, 1965]

MOVERS REFUSE SECOND EVICTION INVASION—
ALLSTON "SITTERS" WIN BATTLE

(By Jack Wharton, Tom Berube, and Gordon Hillman)

The mass street sit-down in Allston, staged by 100 residents of the North Harvard Street area to prevent the Boston Redevelopment Authority from evicting families from their homes, had its effect Wednesday when moving companies refused to send their vans into the embattled district.

No vans were available to the BRA or deputy sheriffs after movers had seen—in newspaper photos—a scene of violence that looked more like Mississippi or Alabama than Massachusetts, as 30 officers dragged and hauled the sitdown demonstrators.

Four men arrested in the wild melee had their cases continued in Brighton district court.

The only moving truck to enter the area Wednesday ran into a frightening reception when it pulled up beside a variety store owned by Mrs. Margaret Redgate, whose son was arrested by police Tuesday night as she battled vainly to free him.

When neighbors saw the truck, they poured out of houses, streets, and alleys and surrounded it. They found that the startled truckmen were only stopping to buy sandwiches at Mrs. Redgate's store.

With no vans willing to go into the neighborhood to cart off furniture all was quiet in North Harvard Street.

Lookouts were posted on every street and most of them were women.

Meanwhile, in Brighton district court, the four young men arrested Tuesday night were charged with disturbing the peace.

Their counsel, Attorney William Homans, waived a reading of the complaint and the cases were continued until August 12.

Freed in \$50 bail were Stephen B. Goldin, of 9 Hefferan Street, and James B. Wheelis, of 4 Hefferan Street, both 23 and both Harvard seniors; Bernard R. Redgate, 24, of 162 North Harvard Street; and David R. Outerbridge, 28, of 31 Field Street, Roxbury.

From Washington, BRA Administrator Edward J. Logue, unsurprisingly declared of the demonstrators: "These people are not my heroes. They have fought the project for the last 8 months. They have gone from hearing to hearing spewing vilification on Monsignor Lally and other members of the BRA."

AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRY
REQUIRE GREATER DEGREE OF
PROTECTION

(Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the past 20 years Pennsylvania produced a total of 1,673,580,000 tons of bituminous coal and 590,343,000 tons of anthracite. The figures would be much higher if it were not for the more than 3 billion barrels of residual oil—equivalent to more than 740 million tons of bituminous coal—that have been poured into east coast markets since V-J Day.

From 1947, when 147 million tons of bituminous coal were produced in Pennsylvania's mines in the postwar industrial boom, coal output in our State slipped to 62½ in 1961, after which we have enjoyed an upturn which is expected to bring this year's total to about 84 million tons. Lest anyone get the idea that we can live harmoniously with excessive imports of residual oil, however, I point out that our share of national bituminous coal production dropped from 23 percent in 1945 to 16 percent for the current year. During the same period, anthracite has dropped from 55 million to less than 14 million tons, a tragic situation for areas of Pennsylvania where mines were the foundation of the economy.

Although gross income to the Nation's railroads from hauling coal since the end of World War II has amounted to more than \$20 billion, the figure would be substantially higher if the U.S. policy did not favor foreign oil shippers over domestic fuel producers. For this reason Congress must not forget that coal and domestic oil alone are not the sole victims of too much foreign oil. Officials responsible for administering the oil import control program must be constantly reminded that labor and industry in this country require a greater degree of protection than is afforded by current restrictions predicated on the import control program.

TIRED CONGRESS SHOULD GIVE
ITSELF—AND PUBLIC—A REST

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in today's Washington News calls for Congress to wind up its routine chores and go home. The writer correctly points out that we have flooded the country with far-reaching, dramatic new programs which will take time, perhaps years to digest. It is time that we paused, returned to our people to hear what they have to say and generally back off to take a look at what we have wrought since January.

August 19, 1965

20309

The Communists had gained control of only 14 of the 3,500 Buddhist pagodas in South Vietnam, but the 14 got all the attention from the press, with their cries of persecution. The Communists also spread the rumor among American officials in Saigon that Diem was trying to make a Catholic state out of the country, and that the 500,000 Protestants in South Vietnam were going to be persecuted.

Ambassador Lodge told President Diem that he should send his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, away. Lodge gave no real reasons for this, and Diem pointed out that it was like asking President Kennedy to get rid of his brother, the Attorney General. Shortly before his death, Counselor Nhu declared that at first they thought Lodge, being a Republican, "would possess good anti-Communist feelings, but he did not. His political views seemed to be dominated by Linus Pauling in the New York Times, and the neutralist preachings of Walter Lippmann." * * * Lodge never stopped working against us. His only care has been to intrigue against the legal government to which he was accredited."

THE BIGGEST MISTAKE

When President Diem requested Lodge to send four Americans away for plotting against Diem, Lodge failed to do so. Lodge told Diem he should replace his ministers, who were civilians, with army generals. He even had the generals polled to see if they would lead a coup. None of them wanted to, but as Marguerite Higgins wrote: "Everyone in Vietnam knew that America had declared political war on Diem."

Secretary of State Rusk had praised President Diem highly just a few months before we instigated his death. So had Vice President Lyndon Johnson, and Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. Secretary of Defense McNamara described the magnificent work done by Diem as "a near miracle." The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, a few weeks before Diem's death, declared: "In the 8 years since Diem took power, Vietnam has acquired full independence, written a constitution, and held the first four national elections based on universal suffrage ever conducted in Vietnam."

To refute the Communist charges that Diem was persecuting the Buddhists, Diem had asked the United Nations to send a fact-finding mission to investigate. The report was due to come out that fall, but after Diem was killed the United Nations did its best to suppress it. It was finally uncovered by Senator THOMAS J. DONN, and published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. It completely cleared the late President from charges of persecution.

South Vietnam had enjoyed nearly 10 years of stable rule under President Diem, and both American and British officials had declared that the war was being won. When the Communists in Vietnam heard about Diem's death, they exclaimed that it was "too good to be true." Of the 8,000 strategic hamlets that President Diem had built to protect the peasants from the Vietcong, 5,000 were taken over by the Communists after his death. The war was prolonged several years by the death of Diem, a death brought on by the policy of American officials. Somehow, through a merciful providence, it is hoped that this time Ambassador Lodge will not impede the defeat of communism, but expedite it. In either case, his appointment remains a mystery.

One of the troublesome developments has been the now stated administration policy of accepting unconditional negotiations with the Reds. The door for appeasement is thus open. At this point, I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks the column by Father Lyons in the August 8 issue of Our Sunday Visitor:

VIETNAM AND THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Statements have recently been made in Moscow and Hanoi, and also in Paris, that we should return to another conference like the one held in Geneva in 1954. That is to be expected, at least from Moscow and Hanoi, as they know that in such a conference they are bound to win again. What is surprising is that Secretary of State Rusk declared that the United States would not object to using the Geneva Conference as a basis for discussions concerning a ceasefire in Vietnam. Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD has taken the identical position.

Even President Johnson declared on March 25:

"We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all southeast Asia." Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also suggested in a major speech to the Senate last June that we return to the Geneva Accords of 1954, "not just in their 'essentials' but in all their specifications." Next to actual withdrawal, nothing could be more dangerous.

The requirements of that conference were that all foreign troops be withdrawn. What the Communists mean by foreign troops is American troops, Korean troops, Australian troops, everything but Communist troops. A Chinese soldier looks just like a native Vietcong.

The Geneva Conference also called for an election for all Vietnam. The Communist north would be certain to win such an election. The north outnumbered the south by several million, and there is a rigid one-party system in the north whereby no one would know anything about the non-Communist candidate. Besides, Communist China can always march a million or two extra voters into North Vietnam.

A STACKED ELECTION

The International Control Commission that would supervise the election, according to the Geneva Conference, is one-third Communist and one-third pro-Communist, and it is completely rigged in favor of the aggressor. The Commission's reports must be unanimous, and even then there is no way to enforce its findings, as the last 11 years have abundantly proved.

The Geneva Conference very simply put in writing: (1) the defeat of France; (2) the unwillingness of either the British or the United States to stand up to communism at that particular time and in that particular place. The safeguards in the treaty against Communist aggression proved to be completely worthless in practice. Even in theory the United States and South Vietnam refused to sign them. Why should America now put herself in the position of accepting what she found so unacceptable at the very time of allied defeat?

President Eisenhower, at the conclusion of the Geneva Conference, pointed out that we had serious objections to it. In Bedell Smith's famous unilateral action at the conclusion of the final session, the United States declared that we, "Take note of the agreement concluded at Geneva on July 20 and 21, 1954."

The dedicated Foreign Minister of South Vietnam, Mr. Tran van Do, who is also Vietnam's Foreign Minister today, cabled Prime Minister Ngo Dinh Diem on July 20:

"Absolutely impossible to surmount the hostility of our enemies and perfidy of false friends. Unusual procedures paralyzed the action of our delegation." * * *. All arrangements were signed in privacy. We express our deepest sorrow on this total failure of our mission."

Three weeks later, Senator William E. Jen-

ner told Congress: "The United States was outthought, outraded, and outgenerated." Why, why then, since this was the case, do our top leaders today declare that we are willing to use such a deadly agreement as the basis for resolving the war?

REDS HAVE MAJORITY

The Geneva Conference favored the Communists in practically every respect in spite of the fact that six of the nine participants were non-Communist: Laos, Cambodia, France, Britain, South Vietnam, and the United States. The Communists had only three on their side in 1954: China, Russia, and North Vietnam. Today, however, the Communists would certainly have the majority. They could count on China, Russia, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, the Vietcong, and probably France, in addition to the fact that Britain has already come out in favor of neutralization. That leaves only South Vietnam and the United States: two against eight.

If we were outthought, outraded, and out-generated when the number of participants was 6 to 3 in our favor, what will happen when the odds are 8 to 2 against us, and if we consent to use such a pro-Communist treaty as the Geneva Conference as the basis for further concessions? Negotiation today is an empty word as it echoes throughout the world. Even if there were someone willing to negotiate with us, we should remind ourselves that we contained communism in Korea, where we failed to agree on any negotiations, whereas we lost Laos for the very reason that we did manage to negotiate over it.

"NO WIN" POLICY

Our policy is still not one of winning. I have already heard from experts in southeast Asia that the people in South Vietnam were "very much astonished" at our recent appointment of Cabot Lodge as the successor to Ambassador Taylor. They were confident that Taylor was out to win, but they look upon Lodge as a man who will give in to the pressure from Britain and elsewhere for appeasement. The day appeasement becomes our national policy, America will be headed for defeat.

To base any future negotiations on the Geneva Conference of 1954 would surely amount to such a policy. Most of the agreements at the Geneva Conference were arrived at privately, during the 40-day recess before the fifth and final plenary session. Most of the agreements were confidential, and have never been published. One wonders how many of our top officials have ever read them?

Mr. Speaker, the American fighting man in Vietnam is performing to the utmost of his ability against unnatural circumstances. The most unnatural circumstance is the restrictions placed on the ability of our military men to achieve the necessary defeat of Communist aggression in that country.

The tragic errors of this administration should not be compounded. Proper understanding of the Communist menace is lacking in the high councils of Government, while the advocates of appeasement and coexistence gain an upper hand in the State Department and White House inner sanctums.

Fe (The) Chamberlain
SOAP, SANDY, AND VIETNAM

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about soap, about candy, and about Vietnam. These subjects may not appear too related, but they are. As a matter of fact, several tons of soap and candy are today on their way to Vietnam to help further the civic action program of our marines stationed in the Phu Bai area near the 17th parallel.

A few weeks ago, I was in South Vietnam with a special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. We did not sit in Saigon we traveled over 2,000 miles throughout that war-torn country to get a firsthand look at what we are doing there. I would like to tell you about Phu Bai. Our marine doctors there, during their available free time, have been doing a most outstanding job in caring for civilians who are sick and in need of medical attention. They say that approximately 90 percent of their cases show marked improvement with the simple application of soap and water, but they do not have enough soap.

We also heard reports of how a few pieces of candy could penetrate the language barrier and bring smiles to the faces of children who are living amid so much tragedy.

So I came home determined to do what I could to help the marines with their important civic action program. I am grateful to report to the House today that, thanks to the big hearts of the people of the Soap & Detergent Association and the National Confectioners Association, 5 tons of soap and candy are now enroute to South Vietnam, and I would like to include the names of the donors for the Record:

Soap: Purex Corp., Lakewood, Calif.; Lever Brothers Co., New York, N.Y.; Armour Grocery Products Co., Chicago, Ill.; Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Colgate-Palmolive Co., New York, N.Y.; Duveen Soap Corp., Long Island City, N.Y.; the Lightfoot Co., New York, N.Y.; the Los Angeles Soap Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; the Theobald Industries, Harrison, N.J.; Lanmann & Kemp-Barclay & Co., Palisade Park, N.J.; the John T. Stanley Co., New York, N.Y.; the Hershey Estates Soap Division, Hershey, Pa.; the Andrew Jergens Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; and Swift & Company, Chicago, Ill.

Candy: the Fred W. Amend Co., Danville, Ill.; Paul F. Beich Co., Bloomington, Ill.; Bonomo Candy Division, Gold Medal Corp., Brooklyn, N.Y.; Brock Candy Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.; Hardesty Candy Co., Richmond, Va.; Tom Huston Peanut Co., Columbus, Ga.; and Luden's, Inc., Reading, Pa.

I was amazed, and I am sure you will be too, to learn that soap and candy could be of much real significance in such a complex war as that in Vietnam. This is what Brig. Gen. William G. Thrash, U.S. Marine Corps, had to say in a recent letter to one of the donors to the civic action program:

Recent reports from Vietnam indicate that the program is paying genuine dividends, not only in the intangible ingredients that go to make up mutual understanding, but in very basic lifesaving acts by Vietnamese. Because of the relationship established by the gifts from your firm, and others, Vietnamese villagers have risked their lives to

disclose enemy ambushes to our marine patrols.

If this pilot project works, I am sure we will have no trouble in getting further contributions of needed items for our civic action programs which are endeavoring to stabilize and hold the rural areas of South Vietnam.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank all who have been associated with this humanitarian endeavor.

WATER RESOURCES TRUST FUND NEEDED

(Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, this Nation, and especially its northeastern section, faces a very real water shortage crisis which we must attempt to meet as soon as possible. Public and private demands for more clean water in the next decade will make this serious problem even more acute.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10539, to establish a national water resources trust fund. Revenues resulting from the Coinage Act of 1965 would be placed in this trust fund.

The recently-enacted Coinage Act of 1965 removes or reduces the silver content in dimes, quarters and half-dollars making an appreciable difference between the face value and the intrinsic value of the coins. As a result, economists estimate that a profit of \$2 billion or more will be made by the Federal Government from these newly minted coins.

The United States possesses the technological ability to deal effectively with the water shortage, but these programs will be very expensive. Consequently, we need a fixed source of revenue to underwrite the research and development of water resources and their use.

It is my hope that the administration and the Congress will recognize the urgency of the situation and act affirmatively on H.R. 10539 in the near future.

DISCRIMINATION IN COMMUNIST RUMANIA

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it gives great pleasure indeed to join my many distinguished colleagues who have cosponsored the resolution of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] condemning the discriminatory measures of the Communist Rumanian Government against its citizens, particularly against the Hungarian minority in Transylvania which I also had the opportunity to cosponsor by my House Resolution 294 on March 24, 1965.

Since that time no improvement of the situation has taken place. The situation of the minority economically continues to be bleak indeed and individuals can

only escape from the rural areas where they are paid 3 lei—price of 2 pounds of bread—per day at the collective farms if they take jobs in areas outside of Transylvania, thereby moving into purely Rumanian regions. And even this choice is only open to the skilled and the young. Politically, there is not even a semblance of self-administration and even the Hungarian Communists are pushed aside by the Rumanians in the party. Even as infamous a man as Georg Moghioros, who has served as a loyal servant of Gheorghiu-Dej from the days of illegality in the 1930's on is kept out from the ruling Politburo of seven, and others are no longer even in the Central Committee of the Party. Police, even in the "Mures-Magyar Autonomous Province" is Rumanian, and speaks no Hungarian and the councils, except in purely Hungarian villages is also mixed, usually with a Rumanian majority. Police terror is still present to a degree greater than in Poland and Hungary. Search of the belongings of foreign visitors in the hotels in their absence is still a general practice and many of them are shadowed if they enter certain cities or areas. Educationally, scores of Hungarian sections are closed down this coming month when schools start again, and the pressure on the parents to keep their children out of the Hungarian section is increasing significantly. Religious freedom is still absent, atheistic propaganda strong and teachers and intellectuals are forced to spread it if they want to retain their jobs, while people still can get fired for attending church services or for sending their children to religious instruction classes. Communal fighting on a smaller scale is a fact especially in the cities and tensions are rising between the two nationalities actively fomented by the government.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances we must tell the Rumanian Communist Government whenever negotiations are entered our strong and unequivocal protest and displeasure felt in view of these measures. Otherwise, how can we pose as the powerful, freedom-loving and just nation, when we let the cry for deliverance by innocent and persecuted people who are in reality our potential friends and natural allies be unanswered? In my speech of March 24, 1965, I listed several points which I believe should be mentioned to the envoys of the People's Republic of Rumania by our diplomats and policymakers. May I now repeat them in a shortened form as they are as timely as ever:

First, restoration of the right to choose employment at a place of their choice by professionals, technicians, and skilled workers. This would also mean that those who would like to move from their present assignments should be allowed to do so, especially if they want to move back to their own areas.

Second, a promise by the Rumanian Government to use American funds and equipment in a manner only which would not deprive Hungarian areas from industrialization and would give equal opportunity of employment to Rumanian citizens of Hungarian ethnic background.

Third, a complete implementation of the 1963 Convention as there are several

August 19, 1965

hundreds of priests, ministers and laymen still in jail.

Fourth. A restoration of the administrative independence of the former Hungarian Bolyai University from the Rumanian Babes University, and the same procedure to be applied to the Pharmaceutical-Medical College at Marosvasarhely—Turgu Mures. Restoration whenever possible of the administrative independence of Hungarian high schools and grade schools, and in any case expansion of the Hungarian sections in the existing ones.

Fifth. Creation of a statewide Hungarian cultural federation which exists even in other Communist countries, the creation of a separate writers' union and actors' academy and opening to the public of the Hungarian libraries and folk art museums at Kolozsvár—Cluj, Marosvasarhely—Turgu Mures, and Nagyenyed—Alud.

Sixth. Permission to use the Hungarian language in speech and writing in Hungarian-inhabited areas in public and in official documents.

Seventh. Reattachment of the districts of Haromszek—Trei Scaune—to the Hungarian Autonomous Province and the restoration of the original boundaries—1953-61—of the same.

Eighth. More proportionate employment of Hungarians in local administrative offices, including the police.

Ninth. Guarantee of the freedom of attending the churches and synagogues and promotion of the education of those who want to enter priesthood or ministry. Restoration of the full freedom of Aron Marton, bishop of Gyulafehervar—Alba Julia—and filling the vacant sees.

THE EISENHOWER DEMURRER

(Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the permanent Record of the Congress should include a very significant and intelligent editorial which appeared in the New York Times today. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the following entitled, "The Eisenhower Demurrer":

THE EISENHOWER DEMURRER

The battle on Van Tuong Peninsula makes evident the extent to which American troops are now directly engaged in combat in South Vietnam. In these circumstances the question of how the United States got into this land war in Asia takes on political as well as historical interest.

Both were involved in the remarks of former President Eisenhower, who conferred with Republican congressional leaders, then demurred from President Johnson's frequent suggestion that the current military involvement in Vietnam is the consequence of a Republican commitment given in 1954. The fact that the Korean war became a critical domestic political issue in 1952 is in all minds.

General Eisenhower emphasized his belief that "the Communists must be stopped in Vietnam." But he said that his October 1954 letter to President Ngo Dinh Diem, often quoted by President Johnson, was a pledge of foreign aid, not military involvement. And he stressed that he never made a uni-

lateral military commitment to South Vietnam, only a multilateral engagement through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Both points are well taken.

It was a unilateral decision by President Kennedy in 1961—not a SEATO decision—that launched the program of massive American military assistance to South Vietnam. Most Asians and most American allies in Europe have always had deep reservations about it. This undoubtedly will continue to be one of the heaviest mortgages on American policy in southeast Asia and it would be unwise to ignore it.

The shift from military assistance and combat advice to direct participation by American combat troops in the Vietnamese war has again been a unilateral American decision, this time by President Johnson. Not only was congressional debate avoided, but there were repeated denials that such a decision had been made. Indeed, the whole effort was to make it appear that nothing had changed in American policy since 1954.

The American predicament in Vietnam is likely to deepen long before it is eased. American casualties are certain to mount. Solutions are complicated by a colonial heritage not of American making, but of which Americans unfortunately may become the heirs as their military numbers grow on Asian soil and as their firepower, unavoidably, takes a toll of civilians as well as guerrillas.

The military decisions of the past closed out diplomatic options that then were open. This is what must be avoided in the future. Difficult decisions that lie immediately ahead may become even more difficult politically when warfare gives way to negotiation, as one day it must. It is essential that the country be clear at every stage where it is being led and why. If this has not always been the case in the past, it is all the more reason for straightforwardness to be the rule now.

OMNIBUS FARM BILL

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. WATSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members of this body to know that I firmly oppose H.R. 9811, the omnibus farm bill. The very fact that it is an omnibus bill disturbs me. Each of the programs contained in this legislation calls for the commitment of millions of dollars, and I therefore believe that each should be closely examined by the House. Without a separate look at each program, how on earth can we ever attempt to separate, so to speak, the "wheat from the chaff"? This bill means higher feed grain costs to 19,000 poultry farmers and 16,000 milk cow farmers in West Virginia.

H.R. 9811 proposes an extension of existing subsidy programs which we all know have failed miserably in the past, and the establishment of new programs that will necessarily result in the spending of billions of dollars in the next 4 years. I agree that some of the Department of Agriculture's programs have been necessary and successful. The expenditures for the many commodity programs however have been neither necessary nor have they been successful in improving the income of our Nation's farmers. Meanwhile, the cost of our commodity programs has increased tremendously since 1960. The 1964 rice

program is up \$12.4 million; wheat is up \$48.1 million; the feed grain program is up \$554.3 million; the cotton program is up \$304.4 million; and the peanut program is up \$15.3 million. But even with this substantial contribution by the U.S. taxpayer, the net farm income is up only \$900 million over 1960.

Obviously these programs are deficient if the Federal Government has to spend \$2 billion to increase farm income by only \$900 million.

Farm income is no greater now than it was 7 years ago. And today, under the proposed legislation before us, in addition to the proven failure of the current commodity programs, cotton is to be included on the list of programs dependent on direct Government payments. This bill proposes to reduce cotton acreage by cash payments to farmers who cut back their present acreage from 15 to 35 percent. We all know that it does not follow that production will necessarily decrease merely because of a reduction in acreage. On the contrary, experience proves that production will actually increase.

Another inconsistency which bothers me is the fact that while H.R. 9811 is supposed to persuade cotton farmers to cut production, it is apparently at the same time allowing any cotton grower the opportunity to produce all the cotton he wants, without any risk of penalties and of course without subsidy.

If this measure is defeated, most of the commodities included will be covered by existing programs which, although not really effective either, are still preferable in my opinion to the proposed costly programs under this bill. Of course if I could have my way, there simply would be no Government subsidies at all in American agriculture. I frankly believe that the agricultural community must move back to its original free enterprise position. It must go back to the market-price system rather than attempting to operate under the current governmental price-fixing setup.

As I said previously, there have been a few USDA programs which have been successful, and this is why I was in favor of the ASC program. But on the whole, these farm subsidies have not accomplished anything for the small farmer. And, may I assure you that the small farmer, particularly in the State of West Virginia, is who I am most concerned about. Accordingly, since H.R. 9811 merely calls for a status quo in the agricultural situation in this country and there seems to be no suggestion of a substantial improvement nor even an attempt to solve the farm problems, I cannot and will not support the bill.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE U.S.S.R.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the growing interest in Senator Fulbright's railroading of the Consular Convention with the U.S.S.R. encourages me to recommend again that our Committee on

August 19, 1965

Foreign Affairs hold immediate hearings on this ill-advised pact. Although it is not within the jurisdiction of this body of Congress to ratify or reject the treaty, yet in view of Senator FULBRIGHT's arbitrary denial of hearing expert public witnesses and other Government witnesses, such as our Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, it is our moral obligation both as Representatives of the people and citizens of this republic to afford at least the opportunity for a fair, honest, and open public examination of this dangerous and contradictory pact.

On August 8 I wrote to the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Dr. Thomas E. Morgan, asking for possible committee consideration. This afternoon I have again communicated with Dr. Morgan, hoping that in view of the grave questions involved, the growing public anxiety, and the lack of Senate scrutiny, the Foreign Affairs Committee will study the matter.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to read the Senate Foreign Relations Committee publication on the "Consular Convention With the Soviet Union," consisting of a single hearing with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his aids, cannot but be impressed by both the rigged character of the hearing and the confused notions surrounding the pact. For example, on page 2 the chairman replies to a member of the committee that it "would have to vote on it after we have committee hearings." As though to confirm Senator Hickenlooper's obvious suspicion, only one hearing was held, involving only the Department of State, and not hearings, affording those who are opposed to the treaty the freedom of open, critical discussion.

As to confusion of thought on this treaty, on page 3 there is a caption "Consular Convention with Russia." The title of the pamphlet and the actual treaty in substance accurately refer to the "Consular Convention with the Soviet Union." As many of our university graduate students in East European studies now know, Russia and the Soviet Union are not synonymous. Is this treaty with Russia or is it with the U.S.S.R.? Logically and historically it cannot be with both. Yet we have the spectacle here, bearing the imprint of one of our highest legislative committees, fallaciously confusing the two, which in many a graduate school would rate a zero.

Mr. Speaker, many other examples of lack of understanding and confused thought regarding this treaty may be cited. To prevent a blind ratification of this pact by our sister body, I urge the leadership of this Chamber to call for immediate, open and public hearings on the treaty by our Foreign Affairs Committee, inviting Mr. Hoover and private citizens to testify. In our democratic framework this is the least that our citizens can expect—an open, frank, and critical discussion of a seemingly innocuous pact.

To demonstrate the conflict of views on this issue, which in all fairness should be given a thoroughly legislative airing, I request that the following items be appended to my remarks: First, the August 13 editorial on "Normal Relations"

in the Richmond News Leader; second, the August 6 Washington Post editorial on the "Consular Convention" and the full and unedited reply to it by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; and third, the Washington Post's edited publication of this reply in its August 16 issue, which speaks for itself:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Aug. 13, 1965]

NORMAL RELATIONS

Details are now at hand concerning the swift railroad job, with Senator FULBRIGHT as chief engineer, which was done to get the Soviet Consular Treaty out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee some days ago. Readers doubtless will remember that this proposal came forth with some fanfare early in 1964. Its purpose was to enable the Soviet Union to establish consulates in various parts of the United States and to let the United States set up consulates in the Soviet Union.

When the deal got a brusque public reaction, it went immediately into the deep freeze. This treaty was definitely controversial. Controversial subjects are not discussed in election years. Nineteen hundred and sixty-four was an election year. End of debate on the consular treaty.

One can nod smilingly at sharp politics, but one cannot nod at the suppression of the public discussion that ought to go with important congressional deliberation. If 1964 was a bad year to discuss getting cozy with the Soviets, 1965 is worse. Khrushchev is gone; the committee government of the Kremlin is edgy. Soviet relations are in a far more dangerous state; American planes are being shot down by the Soviet missiles in Vietnam. So is there a full-dress hearing on the admittedly controversial treaty? Does FULBRIGHT dare?

The consular treaty has long been in seeming repose. Late last month, the usual hints leaked out: The proposal was being revived even though Soviet antagonism was at its height. The scholarly and jovial chairman of the Captive Nations Committee, Prof. Lev Dobriansky, wrote to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as just one witness who wanted to testify at public hearings. Dr. Dobriansky is a specialist in Soviet affairs who is frequently called upon as an expert witness in legislative hearings. He was informed by an aid to the Foreign Relations Committee that it was not known whether outside witnesses would be called.

On July 30, the only hearing was held. The sole witness was Secretary of State Dean Rusk, with his legal adviser. An August 2, Dr. Dobriansky wrote to Senator FULBRIGHT to urge open hearings. But the next day, the committee in executive session reported the treaty out on a voice vote. Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER was the only dissenter present; Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, another opponent, was not there. Thus after listening only to the viewpoint of the administration, the controversial treaty went to the Senate floor.

Among the arguments that Senator FULBRIGHT did not want to hear—or did not want the American people to hear—were these:

J. Edgar Hoover's recent testimony that Soviet consulates would broaden Soviet espionage and make security more difficult.

The precedent-shattering grant of diplomatic immunity to consular officers.

The difficulty that Latin American nations will face in rejecting Soviet consulates after the United States has accepted.

The impracticability of trade with a nation that does not respect copyright or patent agreements.

The failure to obtain concessions for the

property rights of American citizens who are former nationals of the Soviet states.

De facto recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet empire.

None of these arguments was heard. Instead, the only arguments were those of Dean Rusk, who hoped that the agreement would help normalize relations. What is needed is an agreement to normalize the Foreign Relations Committee.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 6, 1965]

CONSULAR CONVENTION

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has done well in reporting out at last the consular convention with the Soviet Union which will so clearly benefit the United States. The committee acted on a voice vote with only one dissenting Member—Senator HICKENLOOPER.

Senators LAUSCHE and MUNDT, who were absent, may oppose the treaty when it goes before the full Senate but it probably will be and it certainly ought to be approved.

It provides for consular protection and services for businessmen, tourists and other nationals of one country while in the other. It opens the way for reestablishing consulates which have been closed since the outbreak of the cold war. With or without the consulates, the Soviet Union has a ready enough access to our open society, but the privilege of having consulates in various additional places in the Soviet Union is a matter of great advantage to this country.

Both President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk have vigorously endorsed the consular convention since it first was agreed to at the end of May last year. The committee has taken its time in acting and it is to be hoped that the Senate will promptly approve it and send it to the White House.

AUGUST 6, 1965.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

Your August 6 editorial on the consular convention contains, as usual, a mixture of truth and fiction. It is true that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has reported this treaty out, but you fail to inform your readers how it was railroaded through the committee without fair and open public hearings. Also, your statement that the "committee has taken its time in acting" is a grossly misleading half-truth. You know as well as I do that Senator FULBRIGHT simply sat on the pact since June 1964, calling for hearings and then postponing them, and finally, in the most undemocratic manner railroaded it through committee for a blind ratification by the Senate.

There is no question but that the advocates of this harmful treaty, who are eager to appease the Russian Imperio-colonialists at any price, have feared right along fair and open public hearings on the Second Treaty of Moscow. A considered and full exposure of its contents would lead to its rejection by the Senate. The statement I addressed to Senator FULBRIGHT in my letter of August 4, I also address to you: "Those who speak piously and loudly about extremists and the constant need for open and critical, democratic discussion of our foreign policy might well, in the quiet of their conscience, reflect on the crass discrepancies between their words and their deeds." If any extremist action was ever taken on any treaty or piece of legislation, this certainly is it. And your comments seem to support such action.

The last-minute maneuver of having Secretary Rusk testify on this ill-written and Moscow-oriented pact does not satisfy the demand of moral responsibility for fair and open public hearings. Moreover, as I pointed out to Senator FULBRIGHT and can easily prove, by "virtue of his antiquated and mis-

August 19, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300130009-6

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4651

been a guarantee back in 1870 against abridgment of a citizen's right to vote.

Even more regrettable is the fact that congressional action was required.

More enactment of the voting rights bill will not of itself subdue the extreme racism that has barred the southern Negro from the polling booth.

It will, however, suspend the use of trumped-up literacy tests which have provided an excuse throughout the South for depriving Negroes of having a voice in the government that rules them.

It will back up that right, if necessary, with Federal supervision of voter registration.

And it will bring a court test on the constitutionality of poll taxes which remain in effect in State and local elections in Alabama, Mississippi, Texas and Virginia.

The key article in the 15th amendment says:

"The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Race and color have been the issues in abridgment of voting rights. Previous condition of servitude is no longer applicable, except as southern Negroes have been bound by the chains of bigotry.

There is irony, however, in the fact President Johnson signed the bill exactly 104 years after Abraham Lincoln signed the bill giving slaves their freedom.

Even more ironic is the fact that a century after the Civil War it was left to the Nation's first southern President to act decisively on voting rights for all citizens, including Negroes.

Pony Express Mail Service

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I am not the only American calling for an improved mail service. I have received letters from thousands of postal patrons, not to mention the many news editorials that have been written about the present poor postal service.

One such editorial recently appeared in the Farmer-Labor Press, published in Council Bluffs, Iowa, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues.

THE MAIL MUST GO THROUGH

From the time of the pony express, the mail service has been a top priority in Government and the most needed Government service. It held the highest respect from the citizens of the United States, but we don't believe this is true today and the fault lies in the service being rendered.

Parcel post has been the downfall of mail service. Breakable material is almost impossible to mail if it is expected to be received at its destination undamaged. It could be that this service needs to be turned over to private firms. There are a number of firms dealing in parcel delivery and are expanding.

The postal department wants zip codes, saying this will increase service, but it seems to cause more confusion than anything else. Spending money to cause unemployment and spending more money to train men without a guarantee of a job doesn't help too much. Let's hire more postal employees and

get the mail delivered! This would help the unemployment picture and take some of the postal work now being done by businesses who are trying to do something for the unemployed.

Getting that dollar circulating is the only answer for economic progress.

Fe. O. Dix
**Our Proven Friends—Vietnam and the
Republic of China**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, in the light of events during recent months in the Far East and specifically that in Vietnam, it is quite clear that the administration has taken the only effective measures to stem the tide of Chinese Communist imperialism in southeast Asia through its friends, the Vietcong.

I commend the President for taking such firm and speedy action to prevent the further spread of the hazard of a conflagration which would inevitably lead to nuclear holocausts of world dimension. I only wish that the consensus of crystalized thinking of responsible people, such as it exists today throughout the Nation, had materialized even earlier so that it could have enabled the President to take tangibly effective action before now.

Such being the situation at hand, it is only logical that we should make use of every and all efforts within that region to defeat the aim and purpose of the Chinese Communists. Toward this end we should help formulate and galvanize all the anti-Communist forces in the peripheral areas in southeast Asia. In so doing, we must bear in mind not only that every anti-Communist country and people should be encouraged to exert their power to maximal efficiency but also that certain peoples who can be in the van of the fray and bear the brunt of the responsibility, be assigned such responsibility.

Aside from the brave South Vietnamese who are doing their share of the fighting, we must also consult with the Republic of China whose indomitable President, Chiang Kai-shek, has stood undaunted against the once greatly vaunted and roaring tide of communism. The 600,000 effectives in its armed forces together with another 600,000 active reservists—and I say active reservists in contrast to reservists that could be mobilized quickly and efficiently to counter any threat when and if they are needed—will be an invaluable asset in the defeating of Chinese Communist aggrandizement.

The Republic of China and its excellent armed forces have served for many years as a counterpoise as well as the deterrent to the expansionist Chinese Communist's grand design. With the activation and stepping up by the Chinese Communists of their aggressive aims, the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea as well

as the Philippines should be asked to make their contribution to their Asia to which we Americans have already contributed unhesitatingly and without stint in order to maintain freedom. I am fully cognizant that we the United States are doing it not only to uphold freedom in the world, but also to assure our own survival as a free nation. The fact remains that the mantle of leadership has fallen upon us not through our seeking but through force of events and circumstance. I am sure, in this all important task to which posterity and history will be the implacable judge, we will give a good and just account of our stewardship and acquit our task with nobility and firmness.

Los Angeles Riots: Personal Responsibility Ignored

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Washington newspaper correspondents is William S. White, and his column carried yesterday in the Washington Post is a splendid statement of fact. I commend it to the Members of the Congress for careful consideration:

**LOS ANGELES RIOTS: PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY
IGNORED**

(By William S. White)

The bloody horror at Los Angeles has produced the predictable outcries from the apologists for any and every Negro crime of violence. It all must be blamed not upon those who committed it but rather upon poor housing, unemployment, inadequate civil rights, or simply something vaguely called sociological unhappiness.

This explanation wholly rejects a thing called personal responsibility. Thus looting and arson and murder and savage contempt for the elementary obligation not to destroy the lives and property of others are excused because those who have done these things felt unhappy and ill-treated by life.

That deprivations are contributory to crime is, of course, true. That such deprivations among the American Negro community (and among the poorer and more forgotten whites as well) should be and must be—and are being—corrected is also true. But to argue, as many are doing, that personal deprivation can and should be put in evidence as any kind of justification for homicidal mania is to argue the most appalling and destructive of nonsense.

The Hitler Germans, for one illustration, were undeniably ill housed, ill employed and full of what is now fashionably called the disease of hopelessness. And many of the same kinds of minds that are now weeping, not for the victims in Los Angeles but rather for the Negro rioters, were shedding similar and slippy tears for the poor Germans three decades ago.

All this then immensely armed the Hitlerites, as all this now immensely arms the lawless in this country. Indeed, the development of a climate that condones murder and rapine for sociological reasons is more dreadful to contemplate even than the passing physical and human shambles in the Negro area of Los Angeles.

A4652

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 19, 1965

For this arms all the enemies of this Nation abroad and adds venom to the slander of American purposes abroad, as in Vietnam. No less, ironically, it slanders the American Negro at home. For the bottom meaning of the dreary song being sung by the apologists for Negro violence is unescapably what? It is that the Negro is not to be held blame-worthy because he is irresponsible—the same Negro for whom the most far-reaching voting rights bill in history has just been passed because he was ready for this highest responsibility in a democratic society.

With many Americans, the apologists will have their way; they always do. But it is interesting to note that among one important set of Americans—the American politicians—the song is not going down so well anymore.

All over this country urban-based politicians, many of whom have made a career of agitating for the most extreme of Negro demands, so long as only the South was the field of battle, are having some urgent second thoughts. It is not possible any more to point the finger at Montgomery or Little Rock or some such place.

The politicians are at last getting the message that the vast majority in this Nation, north no less than south, Negro and white, are tired of violence and destruction even in the name of civil rights reforms which rightly they support.

Not anywhere hereafter is there going to be so much profit in a politics of egging on criminal destructiveness for the alleged purpose of promoting fair play.

Of course, irremediable harm will have been done—harm to this Nation's honor abroad, to what seems to be a dying tradition of some civility in public affairs and public issues, to the old dream of a society based upon a belief that rights march only with duty and that privilege is limited by some obligation.

But even from the thorns perhaps a small gain may at last be plucked. Perhaps the automatic cry of police brutality will one day cease, if and when the bodies of underpaid policemen killed in line of duty are photographed along with all the pictures of police billys descending upon automatically innocent heads.

"The Memory of Her Works of Mercy Will Remain With Us Forever"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with one Federal-aid program after another, foreign and domestic alike, so prominent in the Nation's headlines, it is refreshing and reassuring to read of instances of efforts being made by private citizens and groups to help less fortunate peoples, wherever they may be.

The Washington Evening Star on July 23, 1965, tells of such an instance, and it is one of which I am especially proud since the individual involved in a great, selfless, humanitarian work, Miss Genevieve Zandala, has roots in my congressional district and her work is supported by the Green Bay Catholic Diocese located in my district.

The Star account necessarily can tell only a small part of the story, but I feel

it is one which Members of the House will appreciate.

The article follows:

U.S. NURSE EAGER TO PUT IN LONG HOURS FOR \$60 A MONTH

The shortage of nurses in Latin America will draw a dedicated woman back there soon for another 3 years as a lay missionary.

Genevieve Zandala learned Spanish in 4 months before she went on to assignments in Mexico and Chile as a clinic and visiting nurse under the Papal volunteers program.

Now she's back at Catholic University taking a 7 weeks theology and philosophy course before returning on a new 3-year assignment.

"When you see so few nurses in the villages—no one to teach simple first aid and hygiene—you can see how great their need is," she said.

Whether she is reassigned to clinical work in underprivileged areas or to an opening on the teaching staff of a university school of nursing in Peru, makes no difference to Miss Zandala.

She worked in neighborhood clinics with cooperation from local nurses, supplied from local women's groups, and a once a week visit from a doctor—aside from emergencies. The clinics were inspected by the national health service.

Her \$60 a month salary was higher than the average, due to a higher cost of living in her areas.

The salary is paid by her own diocese in Green Bay, Wis. Her room and board is supplied by the diocese in the area of her assignment.

Miss Zandala worked in St. Joseph's Hospital in Chicago and at Holy Family Hospital in Manitowoc, Wis. before enlisting as a Papal volunteer. She is 40. The program accepts volunteers from 21 to 45.

Almost 80 are attending the courses here, while another 375 are "in the field" in Latin America.

The group, established in 1960, sends volunteers to Brazil, Jamaica and British Honduras.—ANN WOOD.

And I think a testimonial to Miss Zandala, written by a parish priest in Mexico in thanks for her services, most eloquently tells the story. It is not an epitaph but a living praise of a young, active woman still working in her quiet, unassuming way. The priest wrote:

The good which she accomplished among our people was very great, and her memory along with the memory of the works of mercy which she carried out will remain with us forever.

The Real Alabama—Part XLVIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the state of our economy in Alabama is good. One measure of the State's economic health is shown in the following article regarding revenue collections:

REVENUE COLLECTIONS RISE TO SHOW ALABAMA'S GROWTH

If revenue collections are a yardstick of the economic health and industrial progress of a State, Alabama appears to be in robust health.

As an indication of current business activity, collections of sales tax (including the

companion use tax) compared with the same period last year increased by 10.5 percent. For the same period, gasoline tax collections have grown by 5.5 percent and tobacco tax collections have grown by 6.5 percent. Other consumer taxes show more or less the same basic growth patterns. This growth gives every indication that it will continue.

Overall collections made by the department of revenue show increases for corresponding periods, this year over last, 12 percent; this year over 1963, 32 percent; and this year over 1962, 40 percent.

The use tax has grown this year over last by 21.6 percent. This tax is primarily paid by commercial and industrial buyers who make purchases outside Alabama. From this it appears that these classes of businesses are existing establishments and are being joined by new units of commerce and industry.

The phenomenal increase in income tax collections more than any other indicator points to increased employment and profits from expansion and growth of commerce and industry in our State. Income taxes collected this year are larger than collections made last year by 25 percent. A good part of this increase is coming from some 80,000 to 75,000 individual taxpayers who are paying income taxes for the first time this year. This increase in numbers comes about because of better enforcement coverage and better job and business opportunities.

Overall tax collections on a fiscal year basis are, for the year ending September 30, 1963, \$277.6 million; for the year ending September 30, 1964, \$332.1 million; and for the year ending September 30, 1965, as estimated \$338.8 million. Some \$27 million of the increase for 1964 over 1963 is accounted for by an increase in the sales tax rate. Otherwise, these increases are primarily the result of more efficient tax administration, increased business opportunities, and industrial expansion.

L.B.J.'s Talent Scout Needs a Computer and a 15-Hour Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the same time that President Johnson through his Great Society has called for renewed dedication to quality in American private life, he has demanded excellence in public service as well.

The kind of man he has chosen to conduct his talent search and the techniques he uses graphically demonstrate the President's awareness that his appointees are an index to the caliber of his administration. That the President is determined to find the best man for each job is clear from this AP story on the talent scout, John Macy, which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal of August 15. With unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., Aug. 15, 1965]

L.B.J.'S TALENT SCOUT NEEDS A COMPUTER AND A 15-HOUR DAY

(By Frances Lewine)

WASHINGTON.—Whoever scouted the President's talent scout—John W. Macy, Jr.—found a man with a special skill for finding others.

A4658

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 19, 1965

its editorial of August 13, 1965, for printing in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Aug. 13, 1965]

THE HEALTH BILL

Within this century, medical science has achieved such wonders in reducing the hazards of diseases, even to the virtual eradication of some of them, that it may be something of a shock to realize how many are the major ailments with which human beings are still imperiled.

They are many indeed. They require massive attack. An important weapon has been provided in the \$280 million bill, signed by President Johnson, to stimulate and expand research in cancer, heart disease, and other afflictions in which immense and intensive research is essential.

The prospective Presidential panel to study ways and means toward health, education, and happiness will, like the bill now signed, have the blessings and hopes of all Americans.

Fe Murphy
Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the August 8 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times contained an especially fine editorial concerning the current Vietnam situation. The United States faces a challenge in Vietnam, and the course President Johnson has decided to follow is keeping the avenues open for peace talks.

I am taking this opportunity to bring the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Aug. 8, 1965]

THE CHOICE IS HANOI'S

President Johnson's repeated statements that the United States will never back down in Vietnam but will sit down to talk at the conference table seems to be bearing some fruit. Some weeks ago Great Britain sent an emissary to Hanoi to try to convince the North Vietnam Communists that President Johnson meant what he said. He was ignored by the North Vietnam Government, possibly because Great Britain is actively engaged in resisting a Communist push against Malaysia mounted by President Sukarno of Indonesia.

More recently feelers have been put out to North Vietnam by neutral nations. Some of these efforts give promise of breaking through the intransigent attitude of the Hanoi government. It is too early to tell whether these attempts will be successful. But there seems to be some evidence that North Vietnam, for the first time, is listening with more of an ear than in the past.

The Hanoi government is caught between the ideological differences that mark Russia and Red China's contest for leadership of the Communist world. Red China seeks to expand the Communist sphere of influence by military means. North Vietnam is a pawn in this effort. Russia, with pressing internal problems of its own to solve, attempts to expand Communist influence by means of economic assault while offering peaceful co-existence. Ambassador W. Averell Harriman has indicated in his public remarks following his recent visit to Moscow that Russia

has no liking for what is happening in Vietnam. It is unlikely that Russia will exert its influence to bring about peace talks in Vietnam until Hanoi itself indicates that it cannot successfully carry out Red China's course of military conquest.

The burden of resolution of the Vietnam conflict rests with the leaders of the North Vietnam Government. President Johnson has made it clear that the United States will make it impossible for North Vietnam to win a military victory in South Vietnam. He has also made it clear that the United States neither wants nor seeks a military victory of its own.

The neutral nations who are now trying to bring North Vietnam's Communist leaders to the realization are performing a valuable service. They should be encouraged to continue their efforts. Hanoi's leaders must be made to realize that the choice of peace or continued devastation is theirs and theirs alone to make.

Down With Mr. ZIP?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization held extensive hearings this year on the ZIP code system in the U.S. postal service. As these hearings progressed it became obvious that some mailers would suffer real hardships if required to meet the Post Office Department's deadline for mandatory ZIP coding of second- and third-class mail.

The Department's ZIP coding and pre-sorting requirements were originally scheduled for July 1, 1965, and were later postponed until January 1, 1967. H.R. 9551, the bill reported out of the subcommittee, would postpone this mandatory date to January 1, 1970.

The later date would have given mailers needed time to absorb the costs of meeting the new regulations and would also give the Post Office Department time to work out all the bugs in ZIP code and to reassign postal employees affected by the phasing out of some 70 postal railway terminals as the ZIP code sectional centers are established.

The following front page article from the August 18, 1965, Wall Street Journal explains some of the problems business faces in attempting to comply with the Post Office order requiring use of ZIP code on bulk mail by 1967.

The date set by the Postmaster General will probably remain effective; that is, January 1967, but I thought it worth while for my colleagues to observe a newspaper review of the controversy.

DOWN WITH MR. ZIP?—BUSINESS DEBATE GROWS OVER ORDER REQUIRING USE OF MAIL CODE BY 1967—MANY BULK MAILERS DEMAND DELAY, SAYING CONVERSION COSTS COULD BE CRUSHING—BUT READER'S DIGEST LIKES IT

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—Mr. ZIP: Zingy, zestful—or an oppressive ogre?

Post Office Department public relations men shudder at the thought, but their elfin creation is assuming menacing form to a growing number of businessmen caught in a dispute over the use of five-digit code numbers in parcel and letter addresses.

The 2-year-old Mr. ZIP, shown below, by now is a familiar figure to most people. He soon will be starring in an array of new posters and television commercials designed to boost voluntary use of ZIP (for zoning improvement program) coding by convincing the first-class-mailing public it will speed mail delivery. But he also has gotten caught in an intensifying crossfire between backers and opponents of Postmaster General Gronouski's order that users of bulk second and third class mail must begin following ZIP procedures by Jan. 1, 1967, or face prohibitively higher rates.

To understand the conflicting viewpoints, consider ZIP's impact on two companies:

Mailmen, Inc., a Syosset, N.Y., concern, addresses and mails some 100 million pieces of customers' mail annually, most of it third class solicitations. The company's cavernous processing department, where over 300 employees work three shifts a day addressing and sorting outgoing mail into sacks, resembles a regular post office.

THE 553 SORTINGS INSTEAD OF 50?

"Today in a typical mailing we set up for initial sorting to 50 States and maybe an additional 70 major cities or substations," says President Manny Cohen in explaining his opposition to the Postmaster General's deadline. "But the Department tells us that in less than 18 months we'll have to begin breaking down our mailings to 553 sectional centers. This means a bigger investment in plant, equipment and extra payroll without much hope of getting more money from our customers."

The Reader's Digest, on the other hand, has found ZIP coding so useful that it is converting its mailing system voluntarily well in advance of Mr. Gronouski's deadline. The magazine has ZIP coded and re-sorted 70 percent of the addresses of its approximately 15 million U.S. subscribers, and figures the \$150,000 it has invested in doing so already is paying off.

"Under our old method of listing a subscriber's city or town alphabetically, we had to wait until an entire mailing was addressed before we could begin loading boxcars or trucks with magazines for a particular area," says Malcolm Foster, manager of systems for Reader's Digest Association, Inc., publisher of the monthly magazine. "Now all the post offices served by the Buffalo, N.Y., sectional center (ZIP numbers 14001 to 14300), for example, are addressed at nearly the same time regardless of whether the subscriber lives in Cheektowaga or Tonawanda (both suburbs of Buffalo). As a result, our readers are happy because they're getting their magazines 2 or 3 days sooner and the advertisers are glad to get the extra exposure."

FIGHT REACHES CONGRESS

So far, Mr. Cohen's side in this controversy has won a preliminary—though perhaps not too meaningful—victory. A pending House bill sponsored by Representative ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana, would postpone the effective date of Mr. Gronouski's order for 3 years. Mr. OLSEN generally goes along with complaints from third-class mailers, such as Mailmen, Inc., that crash compliance with the order to presort bulk mail according to the ZIP code could impose too stiff a financial burden on many small businessmen.

The Olsen bill squeaked through a subcommittee this year, but it seems destined for eventual burial by administration forces convinced that ZIP coding eventually will

August 19, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4657

groups, the new ideas, the young performers, to get an audience.

I therefore believe all Federal programs should concentrate on getting art to as many people as possible at as low a cost as possible. Regional companies and travelling companies are especially good for this purpose. The Shakespeare company sponsored by the New York Council on the Arts went into many small communities in the State, and we saw the impact that was made.

The American people are trying to make the fruits of culture available to all our citizens—just as we have been trying to make the fruits of economic abundance available to all our citizens. The United States now has 40,000 theater organizations, 1,400 symphony orchestras, 750 opera companies, and 200 dance groups. New art galleries, large public and small private ones, are spreading throughout the country. Programs by great institutions like the Boston Symphony Orchestra are broadcast nationwide.

The spread of these institutions of culture in recent years, is a clear indication of the thirst for culture. But that is where the problem lies. We are not able to satisfy this thirst, in the way it should be, because the artists and performers do not have the economic incentive they need.

The average annual income of members of Actors' Equity is \$2,000 a year. The salaries for members of symphony orchestras range from \$2,000 to \$9,000. As for dancers, Agnes DeMille has said they "eat sawdust."

It think it is a distorted system of values when stage hands in theaters make more money than the performers. And I certainly do not think we are fulfilling the best parts of our heritage when promising young men and women who could become outstanding performers are forced to program a computer rather than play a violin—are forced to go into occupations less satisfying to them and less challenging because they cannot afford to do otherwise.

The American people have recently begun to realize these facts, which artists have known for many years. So we are beginning to see action. Earlier this month the Senate Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities reported favorably on a bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This bill is basically the one proposed by President Johnson earlier this year. But it also incorporates parts of several bills introduced by Senator PELL of Rhode Island, Senator GRUENING of Alaska, Senator JAVITS of New York and myself.

The bill that is before the Senate creates a national endowment for the arts, which would provide \$5 million a year, plus another \$5 million on a matching basis, to help support the whole range of artistic activity, including music. It is the first program for direct Federal support for the arts in the history of the United States. The money could go to groups, such as orchestras, or go to individuals. It could be used to pay the cost of both foreign and domestic performers. It could be used to help artists improve their standards of professional excellence, or used for educational programs, to increase the appreciation of the arts by our people.

Some extremely exciting, very imaginative programs have been proposed. To give you some idea, there are hundreds of young artists who live on next to nothing. Money from the endowment could be used to purchase paintings from them, and make them available, on a rental program, to public buildings, to schools, to individual homes.

There are promising young poets who have not yet made their mark. The endowment could send them around the country to give a series of poetry readings, so they would have a chance to be heard.

We have recently seen the development of small movie companies, prowling the streets of our cities often with hand cameras, mak-

ing movies often of excellent quality. Cinema 16 in New York is an outstanding example of this. This group presently works on its own—but why not start a film academy, which could encourage such people, and train them.

In the field of music, I think we can create what Leonard Bernstein calls a "farm system". A series of regional organizations, which will travel to each of the cities of a region, and in which promising performers will have a chance to develop until they reach the professional level of our great orchestras and opera companies. Too often, an American artist has to go to Europe to perform, in order to become recognized. But with these regional companies, they can be discovered right here at home.

Finally, special efforts should be made to give cultural experiences to children at an early age. If a child has a series of experiences in which he hears music and poetry, or sees plays or dances that he can appreciate, it makes an impression that remains with him all his life, making him into an adult who will appreciate the arts instead of avoiding them.

All these ideas have two things in common:

They help get more income to individual performers, and they help broaden the audience for the arts.

I think one of the finest things the Government can do is to bring together little known artists and communities that know little of art, to create a wholesome new relationship of artist and audience.

This bill would not replace the efforts you are making to get support from the public, or corporations, or foundations. It would supplement them. We hope that in this way, people in the arts will have available the widest range of support for their programs.

When you consider the tremendous need in the United States, \$10 million is not a lot of money. It is not enough, in my judgment. But it is a beginning; and I hope we could build, upon this beginning, a better and broader program as the years go by. It is customary for Government programs to start modestly. The minimum wage began at 35 cents an hour. Social security began at \$20 a week. But as people realize how well they worked, they grew into very significant programs.

In the past, Federal aid has been opposed by many artists because of the fear of Federal interference in their work. But I do not believe that this amount of money, which is so small compared to the private funds spent on the arts could exercise a controlling influence. Even as the Federal funds increase, the bill has a built-in safeguard, because the boards which would make the grants are composed primarily of private citizens, not Government officials.

We have seen, in our aid to education programs, in our urban renewal programs, and in many other fields that there can be Federal aid without Federal control. Even in the arts field, we see in Britain that the British Council has aided the arts successfully without raising problems of Government control. I think it was very significant to the success of this bill when earlier this year the American Symphony Orchestra League reversed its long-standing opposition to Federal aid and endorsed the bill.

Under this bill, the Federal Government will supply the money. But the artists and their organizations will have to make the proposals, do the planning, and select the performances to be funded.

While nothing is certain in the legislative process, I am hopeful that the Senate will act on this bill before the end of the summer—and the House shortly afterward.

We have a National Science Foundation which disburses over \$500 million a year for scientists and scientific research. It has

worked well and has made an important contribution. I see no reason why the Foundation on the Arts cannot develop in the same way.

I would suggest other measures, beyond the scope of this bill, to encourage the arts in America. I think the Federal Housing Administration should guarantee the construction of theaters just as it guarantees the building of homes. Especially neighborhood theaters in places like shopping centers and suburban communities. These areas should have theaters good enough for performances by professional companies. This could do a great deal to extend arts to more people.

I also believe the tax policies of our Government should give more consideration to the special problems of the artist. An inventor who gets a patent for a material creation qualifies for capital gains treatment. Why should not an artist who obtains a copyright for the creation of the mind be offered the same privilege?

And finally I believe we should make the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center to be built in Washington, a model organization for all the enlightened policies we want to pursue. A great deal of its cost—an expenditure of many millions of dollars—is in public funds. The Center should be dedicated to all the people of the country—not just the citizens of Washington, not just its wealthy patrons, but every adult and child whose life could be enriched by the arts. Its ticket policy should be flexible enough so that all can afford some of the productions. The Center should exert a creative impulse around the country. It should help worthy artists who need help. Its programs could well be carried on educational television, nationwide. In these ways, the Cultural Center would truly represent the spirit and desires of the man to whom it is dedicated.

It is important that all these efforts be made by our Government. We may make great strides in atomic energy, and space exploration, in automation, in biology and chemistry. But we will be dull and listless men, amid all these wonders if we do not also expand the human mind and spirit.

Plato once said: "What is honored in a country will be cultivated there." That is what we want to do, for all our people.

The Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is but a truism to state that everyone's most precious possession is his health. The efforts of medical researchers and the results of their labor reflect this fact as clearly as anything. Too, the concern of the present administration and this Congress, as evidenced by the enactment and implementation of the medical care act, is indicative of the crucial importance of physical and mental well-being.

Recognizing the connection between what medical science and the Federal Government are doing about the Nation's health problems, the Baltimore News American has editorialized an unequivocal endorsement of the administration's accomplishments and future plans in this field. I am pleased to second the News American's comments and to offer

A4660

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 19, 1965

toried property flowing through the manufacturing process and place a value on each piece. Tax laws recognize this as ridiculous by requiring that, in the case of inventories, the assessed value shall not be determined as of one particular assessment date (as in the case of all other kinds of property) but on the basis of the average amount of inventories on hand during the year preceding the tax date.

This means assessments based either on a negotiated settlement or on book accounts kept by the taxpayer. In either case, the assessor has not and cannot perform his statutory duty of assessing the fair value of property he never has seen. As a result, the property tax on inventories necessarily becomes self-assessing and tends to vary from one taxpayer to the next, depending upon the competence, prudence, scruples, or negotiating ability of the particular taxpayer.

Even more serious, this tax hits hardest at the very time the taxpayer is least able to bear the blow. In times of business recession when sales and profits decline together, inventories naturally mount. In such times, the manufacturer has the unhappy choice of incurring heavy taxes on growing inventories or of slackening production by laying off workers. The tax thus tends to aggravate unemployment.

These and other defects might be less serious if all manufacturers competing in the national market were subject to the same handicap. Many, however, are located in such States as New York, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania which do not tax this kind of property.

It is not surprising, therefore, that other States which do have this archaic tax give preferential treatment to manufacturers' inventories, either by the terms of the law or by administrative practice. Moreover, determined efforts are constantly underway in many of these States to remove this restraint on their industries' competitive ability.

Connecticut has not been alone in this respect. Among States which recently have changed their laws to alleviate this tax are New Jersey, where a preferential tax rate has been established, and Oregon, where the tax is being eliminated over a 5-year period.

The Manufacturers Association of Connecticut has long been engaged in the struggle to remove this handicap from manufacturers of our State. At the 1963 session of the general assembly, MAC successfully induced the house to pass a bill to eliminate the tax over a 10-year period but met a temporary setback in the senate where senators from cities and larger towns refused to act unless provision was made for restoring revenue loss to the towns.

No statistics showing the amount of tax paid on inventories by Connecticut manufacturers were available at that time. To fill this void, MAC suggested to Tax Commissioner John L. Sullivan that he ask the assessors of the 169 towns to furnish such data. This was done, giving the 1965 general assembly the advantage of a town-by-town breakdown showing the assessment of manufacturers' inventories on the grand list of 1963, and the amount of taxes paid on such inventories. This survey showed that, for the State as a whole, manufacturers paid \$17.2 million in taxes on their inventories on the 1963 list.

Armed with that information, leaders of both parties went to work on the problem in earnest. Following weeks of study, negotiation and compromise in which MAC was deeply engaged, final terms of the bill were hammered out in the closing minutes of the 1965 session.

Under the law, the local property tax on manufacturers' inventories will be eliminated gradually over a 10-year period, with provisions for the State to reimburse towns for revenue losses. The bill carries a price tag:

a one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the corporation business tax rate beginning with the years starting in 1966 (which MAC fought every step of the way in the firm belief that it is not needed). Nevertheless, the price is not considered to be prohibitive.

Manufacturers who have been paying the towns over \$17 million a year in inventory taxes, also have paid the State about \$29 million in corporation business taxes at the existing 5-percent rate. Thus, in the first year under the new law, manufacturers will pay about \$1,425,000 in additional State taxes, but will save \$1,700,000 in property taxes.

In the second year, the real advantages begin as, while the corporation rate will remain the same, savings in inventory taxes will double. In the third year, they will triple, etc., so that, by the end of the 10-year transition period (assuming inventories remain near their present level) annual savings will total some \$17 million.

Details on how the new law will affect manufacturers and its provisions for reimbursing towns or tax districts were given in the Legislative Digest Bulletin No. 17, sent to all MAC member companies June 11.

Milestone in Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on January 13 of this year, President Johnson called on the Congress "to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals."

On August 3 the Judiciary Committee of the House heeded that call and reported an immigration bill embodying the basic proposals suggested by the President.

President Johnson called his action "a breakthrough for reason, a triumph for fair play." The following editorial from the August 16 Washington Evening Star echoes those sentiments, and under unanimous consent I reprint this incisive analysis in the Record at this time:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 16, 1965]

MILESTONE IN IMMIGRATION

The approval by the House Judiciary Committee of a new, liberal immigration bill signals the beginning of the end of a 40-year-old "national origins" quota system. Lack of time probably will prevent the measure from clearing both House and Senate before adjournment this year. But the reforms at least seem sure of enactment into law before another year passes.

The old law reflected a racial and nationalistic bias unworthy of America. It favored admission of northern Europeans at the expense of all others. It fixed quotas rigidly based on the ethnic makeup of America back in 1920. Since it often discouraged immigration of skilled aliens, it failed to serve the national interest.

All these things will be remedied in the new House measure, which would abolish the old quota system. In its place countries now having quotas would be treated equally. If one nation failed to fill its quota, as Eng-

land has for years, the unused numbers could be transferred to other nations with a backlog of applicants. (Last year Greece, with a quota of 308, had a backlog of 98,385 persons seeking to enter America.)

It is none too soon to abolish the old national origins system. As Secretary of State Rusk testified, the United States now has "a rare opportunity to draw migrants of high intelligence and ability from abroad; and immigration, if well administered, can be one of our greatest national resources, a source of manpower and brainpower in a divided world."

For the Record
No to Nkrumah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's leadership in the free world fight against communism has enlisted the support of many nations in striving to seek an honorable peace against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

I salute the President for his handling of this complex foreign policy question. Every American should be proud of Lyndon Johnson's leadership. He has repeatedly said that the United States seeks only peace in southeast Asia and indeed in the world. However, he will never sacrifice American honor and commitment in that effort.

The Baltimore News American on August 11 praised the President, pointing out that he "has repeatedly held the door open for meaningful peace talks on the Vietnam war." I insert this editorial in the Record at this point:

No to NKRUMAH

President Johnson is dead right in rejecting the appeal by President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana for cessation of all air strikes in North Vietnam while the African leader visits Hanoi in a bid to arrange peace talks on the Vietnam war.

The President cabled Mr. Nkrumah that he could have a safe conduct for the visit and would have no need to fear any bombing of the Red Vietnam capital while he is there.

Mr. Johnson, however, was wise in telling him that "the United States would welcome anything that President Nkrumah could do to end aggression." He asked Nkrumah to tell Hanoi that "our military resistance would end when the aggression ends."

Our President has repeatedly held the door open for meaningful peace talks on the Vietnam war. Not only have Ho Chi Minh and his friends shown no interest in them, but they have snarlingly rebuked all American overtures to negotiate a war they continue to press on the peace-starved South Vietnamese people.

We cannot slacken our bombardment of North Vietnam. The best way to get the Communists to the bargaining table is to batter them silly on the air and on the ground.

The American people should not expect much from the Nkrumah visit. In Nkrumah, Ho is welcoming one of his own to Hanoi. Nkrumah and Ho speak the same brand of Commie language.

August 19, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4659

help business as much as it already has helped the Reader's Digest—while also helping the Post Office to cut down its huge deficit.

That may not end the fight, however. The Associated Third Class Mail Users, a mailers' organization, threatens a court fight against the Gronouski order if the Olsen bill should die. "The Department's procedure was illegal," contends Harry J. Maginnis, president of the 800-member group. "There were no hearings and no examiner's findings."

Whatever the ultimate outcome, some postal officials fear the continuous controversy eventually could undermine public confidence in the ZIP code.

PUTTING OFF Z DAY

Certainly many third class users, with a hopeful eye on the Olsen bill, have been putting off Z day. By one frequently quoted industry estimate, U.S. bulk mailing lists contain 5 billion names, of which 4 billion remain to be ZIPped. The Direct Mail Advertising Association surveyed members owning lists of some 500 million names and turned up only half who said they would be completely coded by January 1, 1967. Another 23 percent hoped to make it by 1968. But 10 percent contended the special nature of their lists makes it impossible to ZIP them.

Many members of this association fear they will face heavier costs no matter how the issue of Mr. Gronouski's deadline is finally settled. "The mailers fighting for more time before ZIP coding is required might even win their battle," says John J. Daly, Washington representative for the Direct Mail Advertising Association. "But they're sure to lose the war, because if ZIP code fails, Congress is going to slap bulk mailers with rate increases all the sooner."

The Johnson administration is expected to take a whack at the Post Office operating deficit, estimated at \$730 million in the current fiscal year, by submitting across-the-board rate increases to Congress early in 1966. Of this year's red ink, some \$717 million is expected to flow from second and third class operations, though a \$286 million surplus expected from first class and airmail revenues will offset some of it.

Second class mail has the same priority as first class, but is intended principally for newspapers and periodicals. Third class, a slower service, is designed for book shipments, mail order solicitations and other categories not requiring speedy delivery. The two classes combined now account for nearly 40 percent of the 72 billion pieces of mail clogging the U.S. postal system annually, an avalanche the Department predicts will reach 100 billion pieces by 1980.

As Mr. Gronouski sees it, the success of the ZIP code is vital to the prevention of a serious breakdown in the postal system. By the time his January 1, 1967, bulk mail deadline becomes effective, he forecasts his Department will be moving "more than 50 percent of the Nation's entire mail volume from point of origin to point of destination without once unbagging it or resorting to it," thanks to ZIPping. Eventually the ZIP system will prove "one of the biggest breakthroughs in postal history," Mr. Gronouski maintains, permitting the Post Office "to handle just about any volume of mail this Nation can generate."

For all his enthusiasm over ZIP coding though, Mr. Gronouski hasn't convinced unions representing more than half the Department's 600,000 employees to withdraw their opposition. Officials of the 150,000-member United Federation of Postal Clerks have told Congress that even if Mr. ZIP doesn't cost a single clerk his Post Office paycheck—a Gronouski promise—thousands face relocation to distant cities and in some instances,

pay cuts. One sign of the union's pique: Rejection of 100,000 stationery envelopes on which an unwitting printer automatically had included a ZIP number in the organization's return address.

KNOW YOUR NUMBER?

Post Office officials, for their part, maintain ZIP code acceptance among users of the mails is ahead of acceptances of the old city zone numbers at the same point after introduction. Nevertheless, a Department survey earlier this year showed only 32 percent of first class mail contained ZIP codes in the return addresses, indicating only a minority of American letter writers yet know their own numbers. Even fewer, apparently, know the ZIP code numbers of the people they write to; the survey turned up ZIP-numbered destination addresses on less than 20 percent of first-class mail, and less than 23 percent of third-class mail.

Among the approximately 300,000 U.S. volume mailers, about 90 percent of which are third-class users, the problems of meeting Mr. Gronouski's ZIPping deadline, even when they concede it can be done, loom large, Jackson & Perkins Co., a national mail-order nursery sales firm headquartered in Newark, N.J., offers an example.

The company's list of 1 million active customers can be ZIP coded and re-sorted to meet the bulk mail deadline, says Kenneth C. Tack, vice president. But the job may cost "three to five times" as much as adding the ZIP numbers gradually in the normal course of changing the addresses to keep them up to date, he says.

An additional 3 million names important to the Jackson & Perkins' sales efforts are called from "dead" files of former customers and from old inquiries. These, says Mr. Tack, would require a \$150,000 crash program to ZIP by the Gronouski deadline—a serious burden for a company with annual sales of \$12 million.

"BONFIRE" OF ROSES FEARED

As for still another 2 million names Jackson & Perkins rents each year from other mail-order houses, Mr. Tack contends a number will have to be "dumped" because they lack ZIP designations. This would shrink the company's potential market, he says, and could result in a "bonfire of surplus nursery stock, because we can't put roses on the shelf for an extra year or two."

The Reader's Digest, however, is far from alone—at least among the Nation's biggest mail users—in finding ZIP coding potentially extremely helpful. Montgomery Ward & Co. may have hit on a way to use the ZIP system to realize huge savings in the costs of sending out the more than 54 million catalogs mailed annually by mail-order retail houses.

In an experiment now underway, Monty Ward is sending carloads of unlabeled catalogs to eight selected Post Office ZIP-numbered sectional centers. The labels themselves, however, are sent directly to the individual post offices served by the centers.

"The local post office checks the addresses and notifies the sectional center how many of the catalogs actually are deliverable," explains A. D. Wilson, general traffic manager for Montgomery Ward. "This saves the cost of return postage on nixies (undeliverable catalogs)."

It's still too early to measure Montgomery Ward's savings on the initial shipment of 150,000 of 1965 fall catalogs, which weigh close to 5 pounds each. But since "nixies" have accounted for up to 10 percent of average shipments in the past, the dollar amount could prove impressive.

"We've also found the new system is getting catalogs into the hands of customers days sooner," Mr. Wilson adds. "This could have a big impact on seasonal sales."

State's Competitive Position Improved as General Assembly Acts To Remove Manufacturers' Inventory Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut recently moved to eliminate the inventory tax on materials and goods held by the State's manufacturers. It is my feeling that this is one step toward and a good indication that Connecticut has one of the Nation's most progressive industrial economies.

Mr. Charles H. Schreyer, with the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, has presented the implications which this tax held for Connecticut industries and what the prospects are for the future with the removal of this tax. His analysis appears in the August issue of Connecticut Industry.

With permission of the House granted I place this article in the RECORD at this point:

STATE'S COMPETITIVE POSITION IMPROVED AS GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTS TO REMOVE MANUFACTURERS' INVENTORY TAXES

(By Charles H. Schreyer, attorney, Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, Inc.)

On July 7, Governor Dempsey signed a law which gradually, over a 10-year period, will give Connecticut manufacturers relief from the burdensome tax on their inventories.

This may well mark the start of a new and fruitful era in the relationship between our State and the industries which are the chief support of its economy. It is a milestone on the road to a more complete and sympathetic understanding by the people's representatives of problems faced by industry in efforts to keep pace with the competitors in other States. It is a bipartisan demonstration of the birth, in this State, of a sound economic and political climate upon which industry depends for continued growth.

These are big words but considered ones, supported by a close look at the inventory tax and ways in which it has tended to hinder manufacturers' competitive efforts.

Connecticut industry is a nationwide, indeed a worldwide enterprise which relies heavily upon the huge share of its market beyond the State's boundaries. Were those markets cut off suddenly, industry would quickly wither and instant economic disaster would result.

The local property tax on manufacturers' inventories is a domestic impediment which handicaps the struggle to maintain and increase these markets. Inherited from the distant past when the State's economy was chiefly agricultural, it is entirely unsuited to an advanced industrial State. Today, the constant circulation of inventories through every phase of production from raw material to work in progress to finished goods is the lifeblood of Connecticut's economy.

The property tax is necessarily based upon market value determined by local assessors. By and large, they do a good job in assessing real estate where guided by public records of sales of similar properties. They would be completely at a loss, however, if required to enter a plant, inspect the mass of inven-

August 19, 1965

I had the opportunity on Wednesday, August 18, 1965, for a full discussion with Ambassador Goldberg on the present problems facing the United Nations, including the financial and constitutional issues that are the subjects of current meetings in New York.

After his detailed explanation of the background and reasons, I personally believe that the policy outlined by Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations on Monday is the best course open to the United States in the circumstances as they now exist.

Plainly Incorrect as to Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Times-Picayune of August 10, published an editorial, "Plainly Incorrect as to Louisiana," which pinpoints as clearly and as concisely as it is possible to do the inequity and the iniquity of the voting bill recently signed into law.

Specifically, this editorial shows the complete ridiculousness of Attorney General Katzenbach's drive to register illiterates and proves, if any proof is needed, that the purpose and intent of this vindictive bill was not to bring about the registration of qualified citizens, but to register the unqualified in the hope of harvesting their votes at election time. I commend this editorial to the attention of all:

PLAINLY INCORRECT AS TO LOUISIANA

If Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, or the administration, is going to revive the practice of registering in Louisiana people who are unable to read or write, it should not be done under the masquerade of justice to Negro citizens.

Mr. Katzenbach said Sunday Federal registrars were going to register completely illiterate Negroes because the Southern States had been registering white illiterates, and that now the same standard must be applied.

By constitutional amendment in 1960 registration of illiterates was stopped in this State and so far as we know none has been registered since that time. Even before that, balloting by voting machine made the participation of illiterates impractical for elections involving a long ballot.

A residue of illiterates do vote in Louisiana since those registered up to 1960 were not disfranchised. But even if Mr. Katzenbach wants to fall back on the situation in the 1950's, he could be forthright only by admitting that more Negro illiterates than white were registered either as a percentage of the total population of each race or as a percentage of the registration of each. Negro illiterates on the rolls as of May 1 this year were 12,921 or about 1.2 percent of the total Negro population. White illiterates numbering 20,235 were only about nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total white population.

Negro illiterates enrolled were about 8 percent of the total 163,000 Negro registration in the State. But white illiterates formed only about 2 percent of the white registration.

By any percentage measure based on 1960

population (last official count) and 1965 registration, the Negro illiterates have the best of it.

Mr. Katzenbach evidently is going to apply the same rule everywhere Federal registrars are installed. But he should confess that he doesn't plan to place illiterates on roll in Louisiana because illiterate whites are being registered (which they are not) or because he wants to even up the illiterate registration practice as between whites and Negroes.

Six Louisiana parishes have no illiterates whatever registered. Will the Government agents come to these parishes with an appeal saying in effect come one, come all, let's cheapen and debase the voting franchise by enrolling everybody who can't read and write or be informed concerning the issues of the day?

Whether they do or not, the Attorney General should be guided by the facts when he seeks to justify the kind of policy he has announced.

Peace Corps Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as I have in the past, I am once again pleased to share with my colleagues comments testifying to the effectiveness of the Peace Corps in various parts of the underdeveloped areas of the world. The first of these two statements is from Mr. Leslie Freestone, envoy, officer in charge of the Salvation Army headquarters in Calcutta, India. It conveys his high tribute to Volunteers whom he and his staff have observed over the past few years.

The second is a report of an address by Inche Mohamed Khir Johari, Minister of Education in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya, in which he urges his own countrymen to emulate the spirit and dedication of Peace Corps volunteers.

The comments follow:

THE SALVATION ARMY,
June 11, 1965.

SARGENT SHRIVER, Esq.,
Director, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: During the last few years, we at this hostel, have seen ever increasing numbers of your young Peace Corps volunteers. (We are missionaries of the Salvation Army, whose present appointment is to run an economic priced hostel in this city), and whereas we have seen many of your folk from India, East Pakistan, West Pakistan, and from Nepal, we have, in addition had a large number of terminated volunteers from the Philippines, Malaya, Borneo, Thailand, Indonesia, Ethiopia, and Ghana (I'm quite sure that I have forgotten some, but the main thing I remember is that none of them travel the short way home on termination).

However, the main reason for my writing this letter is to let you know what a grand crowd of young folk you have under your command. We have seen the equivalent volunteers from other nations pass through here, but none of them have had the same sense of purpose, or the same camaraderie, that we have seen in your folk.

Again, when we see your people, they are relaxed and free of speech, and I am sure that you would be interested to know that even in their times of relaxation, they talk to one another, and to other folk, of their work (I, myself, am getting a second hand working knowledge of chicken rearing, egg producing, bridge building, public health work, and so on), they have made friends very easily with other folk who have passed through our hostel, foreigners and Indians alike.

Finally, I would like to say that of the 300 or 400 Peace Corps volunteers that we have seen, we have never seen a bad one. I am not American, but English, I nevertheless say that this is the finest image of America that I have seen, the Peace Corps volunteers.

I simply felt that I had to write to tell you this.

God bless you.

Sincerely,

LESLIE FREESTONE,
Envoy, Officer in Charge.

INCOMING TELEGRAM—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

All papers carried story of Minister of Education praise for Peace Corps. Straits Times July 22, under headline "Emulate the Peace Corps example, teachers told," stated "The Minister of Education, Inche Mohamed Khir Johari, today urged teachers to emulate the sterling example set by U.S. Peace Corps members, and volunteer to stay for longer periods along the east coast." Addressing the opening of the 4-day conference of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Inche Khir spoke of Peace Corps teachers coming all the way from their homes in the United States to teach Malaysian children in remote areas of Pahang, Kelantan, Trengganu, Sarawak and Sabah. He asked: "Shouldn't this be a challenge to our young men and women? The challenge is all the greater when they are asked to teach not foreign children, but our own children, who will grow up to be citizens of Malaysia * * * I would ask teachers to emulate the sterling example set by the teachers who come to our country under the U.S. Peace Corps arrangements." He was making an appeal to the teachers for a "greater sense of dedication to their profession * * *". The Malayan Times elaborated his remarks: "These dedicated young men and women freely volunteer to come all the way from their homes in the United States thousands of miles away to serve our children in the remote areas * * * far away from civilization that they know in their own country."

Fe (M) Evans
What If We Back Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1965, the Colorado Springs Free Press carried a thought provoking editorial on Vietnam entitled "What If We Back Out?"

This editorial discusses the implications of the Vietnam war in terms of long-range results, and I commend it to my colleagues attention.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

August 19, 1965

[From the Colorado Springs Free Press,
Aug. 17, 1965]

WHAT IF WE BACK OUT?

The situation in which the United States finds itself in Vietnam is entirely unprecedented in our history.

This is probably one of the reasons for the great controversy which is currently raging over our position in the country.

Some have said that there is no concrete proof that the United States is vitally threatened in this war as it was with Hitler in Europe or the Japanese in the Pacific.

It would be well to remember that when Hitler and the Japanese started their rise to world conquest, they posed no immediate threat to the security and sanctity of the United States.

If their rise had been nipped at an early age when they did not control so much of the world, the history of the world may have been rewritten excluding World War II.

This is the essence of the policy which our Government is now following in Vietnam. We are trying to nip these wars of liberation and conquest in the bud before they can bloom into all-out nuclear destruction.

Columnist Walter Lippmann believes there are two main reasons we are staying in Vietnam. The first is the fact we will not admit we made a mistake in entering the war 10 years ago and we are now fighting to save face.

The second reason is because we were invited into the country by the Vietnamese Government.

Lippmann wishes to know how long the United States can continue to play "police-man" for places like Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Although I do not agree with Mr. Lippmann in his admonition to leave Vietnam, the objections he raises are valid and need to be answered.

No one knows how long we will continue in the role of world patrolman or how long it may be necessary for us to do so.

Although the comparison between Korea and Vietnam is not an exact analogy, there is some merit as to whether the defense of Korea actually stemmed the Communist tide in that area. The same question is being raised of Vietnam: If we do win, will this provide for the security of all of Asia?

The answer to this question is, in all probability: No, it will not.

We cannot provide for the security of an entire continent by the defense of one country.

However, the other side of the question is far more valid and vital to our national interests. If we leave Vietnam, what will happen to Asia?

Success is always followed up by the Communist countries as we have learned from their successes since World War II.

The same tactics will be tried again in other countries until these capitulate to communism.

Defeat is not total. However, each small defeat the free world is able to inflict upon the Communists is helpful. It provides a pause in which the Communists review their tactics.

Korea may not have been solely responsible for the security of the nations around her, but what would have happened had Korea fallen completely under Communist domination?

We feel that only with limited force can we meet the Communist challenge. A nuclear war would be as disastrous to them as it would to us and they will avoid this if at all possible.

However, should we easily give up Vietnam, and each country which is so threatened in the future, the Communists may reach a point where they feel strong enough to risk a nuclear war.

The question has been raised as to whether we should continue to spend lives and millions of dollars in a country where the people

themselves can't seem to decide what they want.

The answer to this is yes. If the people can be informed through a free press with the threat of Communist terror removed from around them, they then may be able to decide intelligently what they want.

There have been many times in the history of the United States when this Nation was torn and divided and the people could not decide what they wanted.

Why should we now feel so superior and complacent toward a nation which has severe internal dissensions?

The real question is not what will happen if we stay in Vietnam. The real question is, What will the long-range results be if we withdraw from this torn country?

Can we actually afford to withdraw from this war and risk future nuclear disaster?

I do not believe this is right or fair to the next generation who may be the ones to face the results of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Times-Picayune Points Out the Potential of the Saturn I-B

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, New Orleans is indeed proud that within its city limits are now being built some of the most fantastic elements of the Nation's dynamic space program.

The Saturn I-B boosters are now under production at the Michoud Operations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in New Orleans. In an August 14 editorial, the Times-Picayune of New Orleans outlined the tremendous potential of these boosters, and under unanimous consent I am pleased to include that editorial into the Record.

I think it is also fitting to point out that this editorial is typical of the comprehensive news and news interpretation coverage given to space development by the Times-Picayune. The paper has devoted much attention to keeping its readers informed of the exciting developments in space research and technology. Mr. Vincent Randazzo, a space writer specialist on the staff of the Times-Picayune, has done a superior job in keeping the Crescent City informed of progress in the space era.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to recommend the following editorial from the Times-Picayune:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune,
Aug. 14, 1965]

SATURN I-B PAYLOAD CAPACITY PROMISING

The payload potentials of the Saturn I-B boosters now under production at Michoud seems to have escaped general attention in discussions about space missions and the rocket assemblies assigned or assignable to carry them out. These and other factors are significant in connection with efforts under way, just coming to light, to intrude on, supplant or degrade the SI-B in the Apollo or other programs for which it is fitted.

The first of the "new Saturns," or intermediate Saturns, of the Chrysler Corporation's Space Division has reached Cape Kennedy for the initial lift-off in tests and flights

that will lead to human exploration of the moon.

Payload requirements vary of course for different objectives of this 12-shot series. Regardless of what is first put aloft, the I-B assembly is designed to send into desired orbit 36,000 pounds of functional vehicle—not to mention the 30,000 pounds of a burned-out second-stage, should that lagniappe be added.

This rating compares with the 26,000-pound payload Soviet spacemen boosted into orbit last July 16; with 21,000 pounds sent into orbit by the Titan 3-C June 18; with the rated 25,000-pound payload capacity of the Titan 3-C; with the 22,000-pound payload rating of the "old Saturns" with the 18,000 pounds of payload dispatched by an "old Saturn" a year or two ago; and with 4,000 pounds orbited by the Atlas.

The confusion that sometimes attends space program comment was illustrated when at least one Washington dispatch stated, after the 26,000-pound Soviet launch, that only the Saturn 5 could match the feat (ignoring the S-IB). Michoud has vital interest also, of course, in the upcoming Saturn 5, whose missions differ from those of the I-B.

Of course the low-orbit experiments and preliminaries are one thing. There are greater payload requirements for larger orbits and for some outer space explorations. For these, new combinations and new types of rocket stages are planned or considered, such as a Centaur rocket for the final thrust from a Saturn I-B base. Assertedly this Saturn-Centaur could shoot 22,000 pounds for almost any kind of Martian probe, compared with the 450-pound Mariner. The first Voyager-Mars missions for Saturn-Centaur call, however, for not more than 8,000 pounds' payload.

Then there is the "strap-on" rocket system for boosters. The Titan-3C uses, for example, two 120-inch-diameter strap-ons (solid fuel) to help get its great booster-thrust and 25,000-pound payload potential. Projections by Chrysler show that with four similar strap-ons, Saturn I-B could send 75,000 pounds' payload into low orbit; and, with a Centaur, 25,000 pounds or more to Mars.

The momentum generated by the original Saturn firings has provided the space program an enormous asset. The 10-shot series not only achieved 100 percent perfection in functions, countdowns and launch timings, but produced the Nation's largest operational rockets, as demonstrated by the three-shot Pegasus series—one which did not require exercise of full payload potential. Ingenuity in the various branches of production and in the space agency brought successive upgradings of rocket thrust, culminating in the I-B assembly—which, basically, is otherwise the same Saturn.

It presumably is due to this performance that astronauts will be able to man the fourth spacecraft launched in the forthcoming series—in effect, the 14th scheduled firing of the Saturn. For various reasons, other types of rockets have had firings ranging from 45 to 92 prior to use in manned-flight expeditions.

Time for Transfusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1965

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1965, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY and I requested the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Anthony